PAPERS

OF THE

AMERICAN

SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

VOLUME VIII.

REPORT AND PAPERS OF THE NINTH ANNUAL MEETING, HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, DEC. 29 AND 30, 1896

EDITED BY

REV. SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, M.A.
SECRETARY

NEW YORK & LONDON
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
The Knickerbocker Press
1897

BR 140
.A5
v.8
cop.2

Copyright, 1897
BY
SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILL.

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

Div
Pam

1122863

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Constitution of the Society	vii
Eighth Annual Meeting	xiii
Ninth Annual Meeting	xxiii
A Brief Sketch of the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. By Rev. Thomas Cary Johnson, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity in Union Theological Seminary, Hampden Sidney, Virginia	3
The Teachings of Antonio Rosmini and the Censures Passed upon them by Ecclesiastical Authority. By Rev. Henry Clay Sheldon, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Boston University, Boston, Mass.	41
The Ecclesiastical Situation in New England Prior to the Revolution. By Rev. Joseph Henry Allen, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.	67
The Amsterdam Correspondence. By Rev. Edward Tanjore Corwin, D.D., Greendale, N. Y.	81
John Eliot, the Puritan Missionary to the Indians. By Rev. Ezra Hoyt Byington, D.D., Newton, Mass.	111
The Labadist Colony in Maryland. By Rev. Bartlett Burleigh James, Pastor of the New North Carolina Avenue Methodist Protestant Church, Washington, D.C.	149
Wesley as a Churchman. By Rev. John Alfred Faulkner, Pastor of the Chenango Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Binghamton, N. Y.	163
The Attitude of the Western Church towards the Study of the Latin Classics in the Early Middle Ages. By Professor Dana Carleton Munro, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.	181
The Development of the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Roman See. By Rev. Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr., Ph.D.	197

89808

PAGE

HINCMAR: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH IN THE NINTH CENTURY. By GUY CARLETON LEE, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 231

THE ATTITUDE OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS TOWARDS SLAVERY IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES, PARTICULARLY IN RELATION TO ITS OWN MEMBERS. By Professor ALLEN CLAPP THOMAS, Haverford College 263

LIST OF MEMBERS, HONORARY AND ACTIVE 299

INDEX 309

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

[Adopted at the organization, Friday, March 23, 1888.]

I.

This Society shall be called

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

II.

Its object shall be the promotion of studies in the department of Church History.

III.

The officers shall be a President, four Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, and a Treasurer.

These officers and four other members shall constitute the Council, of which five shall be the quorum.

IV.

The duties of the persons just named shall be respectively as follows:

The President, or in his absence a Vice-President, shall preside at all the meetings of the Society. In the absence of these officers, the Society may choose a temporary president from the members present.

The Secretary shall notify the members at least two weeks in advance of each meeting, keep the minutes, and conduct the correspondence of the Society under the direction of the Council.

The Treasurer shall send bills regularly to all annual members, take charge of the funds of the Society, and invest and disburse them under the direction of the Council.

The Council shall be charged with the general interests of the Society, including the election of members, the calling of meetings, the selection of papers, and the determination of what papers shall be published, and the auditing of the Treasurer's accounts.

V.

The Council and all the other officers shall be elected at the annual meeting. But the Council may fill vacancies until the next annual meeting.

VI.

Any person approved by the Council may become a member of the Society upon the payment of an initiation fee of $5.00, and continue a member by paying after the first year an annual fee of $3.00. On payment of fifty dollars at any one time any member may become a life-member exempt from fees.

VII.

One copy of each of the publications of the Society, issued after their election, shall be sent to all honorary and life-members, to all annual members not in arrears for more than two years, and to all libraries subscribing $3.00 annually.

VIII.

Persons not residing in America may be elected honorary members.

IX.

The Society shall meet annually at such time and place as the Council may determine. Special meetings may be called at the discretion of the Council. Ten members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may sit for the purpose of hearing and discussing papers presented.

X.

This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any annual meeting, provided that notice of such amendment shall be given at the preceding annual meeting, or the amendment itself shall be approved by the Council before the meeting at which it shall be voted upon.

THE EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

THE EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

The Society met in Hamilton Hall, one of the buildings of Columbia College, 49th Street and Madison Avenue, New York City, on Thursday and Friday, December 26 and 27, 1895.

The first session was at 8.15 P.M. The President of the Society, Bishop Hurst, presided and called upon the Rev. Prof. Egbert C. Smyth, D.D., to pray. He then made a brief address upon the importance of parish histories, mentioned by name and characterized some of the more famous or valuable of such histories, and alluded to the great stores of parochial history still in manuscript.

The Secretary then read his annual report, which is as follows:

The Secretary has the honor to submit this report. During the year 1895 eleven new members have been enrolled and eight have resigned. Two have died, ex-President Rhoads and the Honorable Frederick Douglass—and of them a brief biographical mention is appropriate.

JAMES RHOADS[1] was born on the 21st day of January, 1828, in his ancestral home in Marple Township, Delaware County, Pa. His parents were Orthodox Friends, and he accepted their religious faith. His early associations were everyway favorable to the development of a symmetrical character, physically, mentally, and spiritually. He did not receive a collegiate education, but graduated in medicine at

[1] The "E" which appears in his name was a mere initial.

the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1851, and for many years practised at Germantown. He was, however, more interested in philanthropy than in medicine, and so relinquished a lucrative practice in order to devote himself to the relief and elevation of the emancipated slaves and the Indians. In 1885 he removed to Bryn Mawr, near Philadelphia, and became president of the newly founded college for women established by the Orthodox Friends. "In this new and difficult position he displayed rare gifts of organization and administration. His deep interest in the spiritual welfare of the students was continually manifested." Ill health compelled his retirement from the presidency on Aug. 31, 1894, but he continued to occupy the chair of Christian Ethics. The close of his earthly life was peaceful and without warning. On Wednesday, Jan. 2, 1895, he dropped dead in the railway station at Bryn Mawr while waiting for a train.

Mr. Rhoads received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1890.[1] He joined this Society Friday, April 24, 1891.

The Honorable FREDERICK DOUGLASS was born at Tuckahoe, near Easton, Maryland, in February, 1817. His father was a white man, but his mother was a negro slave, and he had much more the appearance of a negro than a white man. His master was Colonel Lloyd, who sent him when 10 years of age to live in Baltimore with a relative. There he found employment in a shipyard, and what was of more importance learned to read and write. In 1838, when 21 years old, he escaped to New Bedford, Mass., and changed his name from Lloyd to Douglass. He entered upon the career of public speaker in which he won deserved praise, and became the eloquent pleader of the Anti-Slavery cause. He was appointed agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and as lecturer was well known in the United States and

[1] The above sketch is chiefly based upon the "Memorial Minute . . . adopted by the monthly meeting of Friends of Philadelphia for the Western District, the twenty-fourth of Fourth Month, 1895." *Cf.* The "Memorial Meeting" held in his honor in Bryn Mawr College, Jan. 7, 1895. Both pamphlets were kindly furnished by the present head of that institution.

Great Britain. For a time he edited a weekly journal called the *North Star*, published in Rochester, N. Y.; and in 1870, became editor of the *New National Era*, published at Washington, D. C. In 1871 he became Assistant Secretary to the Commission to Santo Domingo. From 1877 to 1881 he was United States Marshal for the District of Columbia; from 1881–86 Recorder of Deeds in that District; from 1889–91 United States Minister resident and Consul-General at Hayti, and his removal was a political blunder. Since then he lived in private life, and passed quietly away in his home at Anacostia Heights, near Washington, D. C., Wednesday, Feb. 20, 1895.

He was the author of several autobiographies, *Narrative of My Experience in Slavery*, Boston, 1844; *My Bondage and My Freedom*, Rochester, 1855; *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass*, Hartford, 1881. He joined this society, Saturday, Feb. 20, 1892.

The literary enterprise of the Society, the publication of a series of histories of the chief denominations of our country, is well-nigh completed. All the volumes planned, save that on Methodism, have now appeared, and that is partially written. The concluding volume, on American Christianity as a whole, is expected from its appointed author, the Rev. Dr. Leonard Woolsey Bacon, during next year. During this year there have appeared vol. vi., on Monday, April 29, 1895, *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States*, by Robert Ellis Thompson, D.D.; vol. vii., Wednesday, October 23, 1895, *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, by Charles C. Tiffany, D.D., Archdeacon of New York; vol. viii., on Monday, March 11, 1895, *A History of the Reformed Church, Dutch; the Reformed Church, German; and the Moravian Church in the United States*, by E. T. Corwin, D.D., Professor J. H. Dubbs, D.D., and Professor J. T. Hamilton, respectively; and vol. ix., on Thursday, April 15, 1895, *A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, by Thomas O'Gorman, D.D., Professor of Church History in the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

In closing it may fitly be noted that several noteworthy volumes have been produced during the year by our active members, other than those just mentioned. One, the Rev. Professor Dr. Henry Clay Sheldon, published a complete *History of the Christian Church*, in 5 vols., 8vo, New York and Boston: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. This was mentioned in the secretary's report last year but the volumes were not put on sale till this year, and they are already in their second edition. Another member, the Rev. Professor Dr. Henry Martyn Baird, published *The Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, in 2 vols., 8vo, N. Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, and thus completed a lifetime of laborious historical investigation devoted to the single theme. He has won the proud and eminently truthful designation of "The Historian of the Huguenots." Bishop Hurst has laid us all under contribution by his comprehensive, bibliographic publication *The Literature of Theology*, N. Y.: Harper & Brothers. The Rev. Professor Dr. A. Spaeth has perpetuated the memory of a good man and one of our former associates in his memorial *(Erinnerungsblätter)* of D. Wilhelm Julius Mann, Reading, Pa.: Pilger-Buchhandlung. The Rev. Professor Henry C. Vedder issued *Talks to Baptist Young People*, Phila.: American Baptist Publishing Society. The Rev. Dr. Daniel Dorchester has found time since his release from the service of the Government as superintendent of the Indian schools, to issue thoroughly revised and enlarged editions of the widely read and very useful volumes. *The Problem of Religious Progress*, N. Y.: Methodist Book Concern, and *Christianity in the United States*, same. Bishop Perry is to be credited with the handsome volume *The Episcopate in America*, N. Y.: Christian Literature Co.

The Treasurer presented the following report:

1894.		
Dec. 31.	Janitor's fee, 1894 meeting	$2.00
1895.		
Mar. 26.	Bill of Hartford Seminary Press, March 18, 1895	8.50
April 4.	Paid Treasurer for advances in 1894	100.00
" 26.	Secretary's honorarium for 1894	25.00
July 3.	Knickerbocker Press bills, June 21, 1895; May 31, 1895	15.50
" 10.	Postage	3.49
Aug. 21.	G. P. Putnam's Sons, advance for Vol. VIII	150.00
Dec. 11.	Postage	3.82
" 26.	G. P. Putnam's Sons, for Vol. VII	175.00
" 26.	Cash in Treasurer's hands	1.00
" 26.	Balance in bank	18.01
		$502.32

On other side read:

1895.		
Jan. 1.	Balance on hand	$9.32
Dec. 26.	Received from dues, etc	493.00
		$502.32

The single paper of the session was "The Crusades," by Rev. James Meeker Ludlow, D.D., Litt.D., pastor of the Presbyterian Church of East Orange, New Jersey; and it was discussed by Bishop Hurst, Dr. Booth, Dr. Norcross, Dr. Wolf, and others.

The second session was opened at 10 o'clock on Friday morning. The secretary read, in the absence of its author, the paper prepared by Rev. Thomas Cary Johnson, D.D., Professor of Church History in the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary, at Hampden Sidney, Va., upon "The Synod of the South." Rev. Egbert Coffin Smyth, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Congregational Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass., read his paper upon "Jonathan Edwards' 'Of Being'"; and it was discussed by Dr. Chambers and Dr. Tiffany. Rev. Walter Laidlaw, of New York city, read his paper upon "The History of Theological Propædeutic," and Dr. Lewis made some remarks upon it. The session closed with the reply by Dr. Smyth to Dr. Tiffany's question whether there was any truth in the rumor that a paper from Jonathan Edwards on the Trinity had been suppressed as "unsound." Dr. Smyth declared that there was no truth in the report.[1]

[1] The position of Jonathan Edwards upon the doctrine of the Trinity is fully argued in Rev. Professor Dr. A. V. G. Allen's monograph, *Jonathan Edwards* (Boston, 1889), pp. 338–376.—Note by the Secretary.

The President announced as the committee on nomination of officers and place of next annual meeting, Rev. Professors Hamilton and Christie and the Secretary.

At the conclusion of the session the members lunched together at the City Club, No. 677 Fifth Avenue, on invitation of the treasurer and secretary.

The third and concluding session was opened at 3.30 P.M. The President announced that the Rev. Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J., had sent in a paper upon "The Archæology of the Mode of Baptism," which would be published in the proceedings.

Two papers were read. The first was by Mr. George H. Ferris, of the Senior Class, Union Theological Seminary, New York City, on "Harnack's Theory of the Rise of the New Testament Canon," which was discussed by Rev. Mr. Haas and Dr. Wolf. The second was by Rev. John Nicum, D.D., Director of Wagner College, Rochester, N. Y., on "Saint Augustine on the Inspiration of the Bible."

The nominating committee made their report, which on motion was accepted and adopted, and is as follows:

President: Rev. Prof. Dr. George Park Fisher. Vice-Presidents: Rev. Drs. Henry Martyn Baird, Henry Eyster Jacobs, Egbert Coffin Smyth, and Charles Comfort Tiffany. Secretary: Rev. Dr. Samuel Macauley Jackson, 14 East 31st St., New York City. Treasurer: Mr. Barr Ferree, 231 Broadway, New York City. Councillors: Rev. Drs. Talbot Wilson Chambers, John Fletcher Hurst, Henry Mitchell MacCracken, and Arthur Cushman McGiffert.

The place set was Boston, Mass., if suitable arrangements could be made; otherwise it was recommended to convene again in New York City.[1]

In view of the serious deficiency in our income it was

RESOLVED: 1. That the Treasurer be instructed to make renewed efforts to obtain payment from delinquent members,

[1] Owing to circumstances New York was finally chosen as the place of meeting.—Note by the Secretary.

and to assess each member a sufficient sum to make up the deficiency.

2. That the Society establish this rule for future guidance: No expenditure shall be incurred by the Society in any one year, which shall exceed the receipts of the Society for that year from annual dues, entrance fees, sale of papers or other sources; and further that no expenditure shall be incurred which shall leave the Society in debt at the end of the year.

3. That the resolution just passed be printed and sent to every member along with his bill and assessment for the year.

In view of the voluntary retirement of Bishop Hurst from the office of President, which he has held since the death of Dr. Schaff, the founder and first president of the Society, it was

RESOLVED, That we herewith tender to Bishop Hurst a hearty vote of thanks for the courteous manner in which he has presided over the meetings of this Society.

A vote of thanks was also given to Columbia College for its generous courtesy in providing us so convenient and pleasant a place of meeting, and to the treasurer and secretary for their entertainment of the members at luncheon.

The session was concluded by the adoption of the following resolutions, drafted by Rev. Dr. Egbert C. Smyth:

At a meeting of "The American Society of Church History," held in the City of New York, December 27th, 1895, and attended by members of various branches of the Christian Church in the United States, it was

RESOLVED, *First*, That we express our appreciation of the energetic measures which have been taken by the United States Government for the protection of American citizens resident in the Ottoman Empire, and our strong desire that whatever further can be done to this end may be effected.

RESOLVED, *Second*, That the present situation of many of these our fellow-citizens in the Turkish Empire requires that its Government be definitely assured that the Government of the United States understands by the protection of its citizens in the Turkish Empire not merely the safety of

their lives, and indemnification for all property destroyed by violence, but no less their security in their legitimate calling, business, and work, and the condign punishment of those who interfere therewith.

RESOLVED, *Third*, That we deem it of immediate importance that our Government obtain from the Ottoman Government the *exæquaturs* which are requisite in order that consuls of the United States, already appointed and sent out, may proceed at once to their posts.

RESOLVED, *Fourth*, That we express our highest sympathy for our fellow Christians who are passing through a persecution no less horrible than any that has preceded in the history of the Christian Church. We honor the glorious fidelity of those who have already won the crown of Christian Martyrdom, and we confess our deep sense of mortification and shame that confessed Christian powers have thus far done so little to stay the hand of such ruthless cruelty.

RESOLVED, *Fifth*, That we commend to all whom we may influence the mission of the American Red Cross for the relief of the survivors of the outrages already perpetrated upon the Armenians, many thousands of whom are in immediate need of the simplest necessaries of life, and ask that contributions, according to the great need, may be sent to Miss Clara Barton (President and Treasurer of the *American Red Cross*), who is only awaiting the necessary funds in order to proceed at once to Turkey on her enterprise of charity.

The meeting was dismissed with prayer and the apostolic benediction by Dr. Norcross.

The following members were in attendance: Abbott, Booth, Burrell, Chambers, Christie, Coe, Corwin, Cramer, Drury, Elliott, Ewell, Ferree, Good, Haas, J. T. Hamilton, Hurst, S. M. Jackson, Laidlaw, Lewis, Ludlow, McGiffert, Nicum, Norcross, J. R. Smith, Smyth, Spaeth, Steele, Tiffany, and Wolf.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON,
Secretary.

THE NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

THE NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

The Society met in Room 28, Hamilton Hall, one of the buildings of Columbia University, Forty-ninth Street and Madison Avenue, New York City, on Tuesday and Wednesday, Dec. 29 and 30, 1896.

At 2.30 P.M. on Tuesday there began a private session, attended only by members, to consider the following paper:

PROPOSED PLAN OF UNION WITH THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY IN NEW YORK CITY, NOV. 19, 1896.

To the Council of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

GENTLEMEN:—The Council of our Society would respectfully lay before your body the following propositions:

1st, That we be allowed to incorporate ourselves with your membership as a body; our annual members to be your annual members; our life members to be life members in your Association.

2d, That you will constitute a Section, to be called "The Church History Section," to be composed of such members of the Association as choose to be present on any occasion at its meeting, and to take part in the meeting.

3d, This Section shall meet on the same days with the general Association, and, if convenient, in the same place, and shall have its own Chairman and Secretary elected by the Section during the previous Annual Meeting of the Association.

4th, The officers of the Section named above shall be *ex officio* members of the Council of the Association.

5th, All papers upon Church History presented to the Association at its Annual Meeting shall be referred to the Church History Section, in which, if its officers so determine, they shall be read, unless in the judgment of the Section officers they are of such general interest as properly to be read in the General Session, in which case they are to recommend these papers to the Program Committee.

6th, The advisability of printing any of the papers read in the Church History Section shall be determined by the Program Committee of the Association, of which the Secretary of the Section shall be *ex officio* a member, and no such paper shall be published without his consent.

The President, Rev. Dr. Fisher, was in the chair, and the Rev. Dr. Byington offered prayer. The President then called for the report of the Secretary for 1896, which was as follows:

Owing to the cost of the volume for 1894, issued last year, having compelled the Society to begin the year 1896 very much in debt, it was not possible to publish a volume this year; but it is satisfactory to record that the exertions of the Treasurer have happily resulted in paying all our indebtedness. The thanks of the Society are due him for his persistent and faithful labors.

During the year there have been a few nominations to membership; but the Council, in view of the possibility, to say the least, that this Society will pass over into the American Historical Association, preferred not to take action upon them. Eight members resigned.

Only one member, the Rev. Dr. CHAMBERS, has died during the year, but he was one we could ill afford to lose. As modesty was one of his most engaging characteristics, it would be displeasing to him to dwell at length upon his life: but his worth as a man, and his eminence as a scholar, entitle him to more than passing mention. Talbot Wilson Chambers was born at Carlisle, Pa., Feb. 25, 1819, and died in his home, 70 W. 36th St., New York City, on Monday, Feb. 3, 1896. Thus his life covered nearly seven years more than the seventy years which the Psalmist allots to man, but his last days were so useful that all wished they

might be indefinitely prolonged. He was graduated from Rutgers College in 1834, consequently when only fifteen years old; but already he was an earnest student, and the equal of any in his class in intellectual development. His theological studies were carried on at New Brunswick and Princeton; and in 1839 he became pastor of the Second Reformed Church of Raritan, at Somerville, N. J., and so continued till 1849, when he came to New York City as one of the pastors of the Collegiate Church, in the Reformed Protestant Dutch denomination. In 1893 he became senior pastor in that church. Though all his life a pastor, he was several times called to fill temporarily a professor's chair. His tastes were bookish, his industry incessant, his mental accumulations unusual. He was a good classical scholar, and his reputation as a Hebraist was attested by his being asked to serve on the Old Testament Company of the American Bible Revision Committee. He was more than a linguist. He loved literature, and chiefly the Bible, and had a consuming desire to acquaint himself at first-hand with the master minds. He belonged to the very select Greek Club in this city, and read the Greek dramatists and philosophers in their own tongue; but for every hour he gave to such study, he gave ten to the study of the Scriptures. He kept not his learning to himself. He gave it forth, but mostly in the shape of reviews and articles in the religious press. He wrote, however, a few books, including a commentary on Zechariah, a life of Theodore Frelinghuysen, and the Vedder Lecture on the Psalms. He also shared as translator and editor in the American edition of Lange's *Commentary;* and wrote the *Companion to the Revised Old Testament* (1885.) He was a careful writer, and master of a concise and graceful style. He was one of the original members of this Society, and served in its Council since 1890. In his own denomination he was a leader, and in his private life exemplary and devout. In short, he was a power for good, and held in the highest honor by his innumerable friends.[1]

[1] See *A Discourse Commemorative of the Reverend Talbot Wilson Chambers, S.T.D., LL.D., by the Reverend Edward B. Coe, D.D., LL.D.*, N. Y., 1896.

The last volume of the series on the religious denominations in this country, as originally planned, appeared on Friday, Dec. 11th,—the volume on the Methodists, by Dr. Buckley. The supplemental volume on American Christianity as a whole, by Rev. Leonard Woolsey Bacon, D.D., is now appearing in serial form as the supplement in the magazine *Christian Literature*.

It will be convenient to recapitulate here the facts as to the contents, authors, and dates of appearance, of the series of volumes upon American Church History planned in Washington, D. C., on Dec. 31, 1890, and published by the Christian Literature Co., New York City.

Vol. I. The Religious Forces of the United States. By H. K. Carroll, Friday, Nov. 10, 1893.

Vol. II. A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States. By A. H. Newman, Wednesday, Dec. 5, 1894.

Vol. III. A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States. By W. Walker, Monday, July 9, 1894.

Vol. IV. A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. By H. E. Jacobs, Monday, Dec. 18, 1893.

Vol. V. A History of Methodists in the United States. By J. M. Buckley, Friday, Dec. 11, 1896.

Vol. VI. A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States. By R. E. Thompson, Monday, April 29, 1895.

Vol. VII. A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By C. C. Tiffany, Wednesday, Oct. 23, 1895.

Vol. VIII. A History of the Reformed Church, Dutch; the Reformed Church, German; and the Moravian Church in the United States. By E. T. Corwin, J. H. Dubbs, and J. T. Hamilton, respectively, Monday, March 11, 1895.

Vol. IX. A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. By T. O'Gorman, Thursday, Aug. 15, 1895.

Vol. X. A History of the Unitarians and Universalists in the United States. By J. H. Allen and R. Eddy, respectively, Friday, Aug. 17, 1894.

Vol. XI. A History of the Methodist Church, South; the United Presbyterian Church; the Cumberland Presbyterian Church; and the Presbyterian Church, South. By G. Alexander, J.

B. Scoulller, R. V. Foster, and T. C. Johnson, respectively, Friday, March 9, 1894.

Vol. XII. A History of the Disciples of Christ, the Society of Friends, the United Brethren in Christ, and the Evangelical Association. By B. B. Tyler, A. C. Thomas and R. H. Thomas, D. Berger, and S. P. Spreng, respectively; and a Bibliography of American Church History, by S. M. Jackson, Tuesday, May 29, 1894.

The Council met on Nov. 5th and 19th to consider the proposition to amalgamate with the American Historical Association, and formulated the plan which it now lays before the Society.

In closing this brief report, the Secretary takes pleasure in mentioning by title such religious and historical publications by members of this Society during 1896 as have come to his notice: L. Abbot, *Christianity and Social Problems*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, & Co.; L. W. Bacon, *Irenics and Polemics, with Sundry Essays in Church History*, N. Y. Christian Literature Co.; H. M. Booth [W.W.S. Lewis], *Critical Commentary on Matthew*, N. Y., Funk & Wagnalls; H. S. Burrage, *True to the End*, Phila., Am. Bap. Pub. Soc.; E. H. Byington, *The Puritan in England and New England*, Boston, Roberts Bros.; H. K. Carroll, *The Religious Forces of the United States*, N. Y., Chr. Lit. Co. (2d ed.); Robert Eddy, *Universalist Register*, Boston, Universalist Pub. Soc. (annual publication); G. P. Fisher, *History of Christian Doctrine*, N. Y., Chas. Scribner's Sons; same, *Brief History of the Nations and of their Progress in Civilization*, N. Y., American Book Co.; H. C. Lea, *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*, 3 vols., Phila., Lea Brothers; J. M. Ludlow, *The Age of the Crusades*, N. Y. Christian Literature Co.; same, *The Baritone's Parish*, N. Y., Revell; A. H. Newman, *A History of Antipedobaptism*, Phila., Am. Bap. Pub. Soc.; E. A. Schell, *Epworth League Bible Studies*, N. Y., Methodist Book Concern; H. M. Scott, *Origin and Development of the Nicene Theology*, Chicago Theol. Sem.; O. J. Thatcher (with F. Schwill), *Europe in the Middle Age*, N. Y., Chas. Scribner's Sons; J. H. Vincent, *The Table*

Altar, N. Y., Revell; R. F. Weidner, *Studies in the Book*, 3 vols., N. Y., Revell (new ed.); A. C. Zenos, *Compendium of Church History*, Phila., Pres. Bd. Pub.

The Lutheran Commentary, edited by H. E. Jacobs, and published by the Christian Literature Co., N. Y., had contributions from three of our membership: A. Spaeth (John), H. E. Jacobs (Romans and 1 Cor. 1–6), C. T. Horn (Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians).

The Treasurer then read his report, which was as follows:

The American Society of Church History in account with Barr Ferree, Treasurer, from December 31, 1895, to December 31, 1896.

RECEIPTS.

Balance	$ 18.01	
Received from Members	497.50	$515.51

EXPENDITURES.

Janitor's fee, 1895 Meeting	$ 2.00	
G. P. Putnam's Sons, on account, Vol. VII	50.00	
Secretary's advances to printer	330.87	
Secretary's Honorarium, 1895	25.00	
" " 1896	25.00	
Knickerbocker Press, printing bills	12.55	
Secretary's reimbursement for printing	9.50	
Postage (Treasurer)	6.74	
Balance on hand	53.85	
		$515.51

The next order of business was the consideration of the report of the Council upon the proposed union with the American Historical Association, which, by request of the President, was made by the Secretary, who gave the reasons of the Council for making the proposition.

These reasons were briefly: (1) The loss in membership since 1893; (2) the unsatisfactory condition of the Society's finances resulting therefrom, so that the Society could not continue to issue its annual bibliography of Church History, much less embark on any scholarly publication which should be a contribution to the general subject; (3) the continued

lack of support from the teachers of Church History throughout the country, even from those in prominent institutions; (4) that as Church History is only a part of general history, its students should ally themselves with the students of the general subject; and this they can do by joining the national, large, and progressive Association for the promotion of historical studies.

It was also explained that the plan called for the formation of a permanent section of Church History in the American Historical Association; and so the interests of our special study would be conserved.

Remarks were made by the President, Dr. MacCracken, and others. After as many members as desired to ask questions or to make remarks had spoken, the vote was taken, and, without a dissenting voice, the proposed plan of union was accepted and adopted.

The President then appointed Dr. McGiffert, Dr. Richardson, and the Secretary, the Committee of Conference with the Council of the American Historical Association, that Association being in session in the same place and at the same time with this Society.

This action closed the private session.

At 3.30 P.M. the first public session was opened by the reading by the author, Rev. Prof. Dr. Henry Clay Sheldon of Boston University, of his paper "The Teachings of Antonio Rosmini, and the Censures passed upon them by Ecclesiastical Authority." The next paper was by Mr. Guy Carleton Lee, of John Hopkins University, Baltimore, upon "The Revolution in the Church Constitution in the Ninth century"; followed by that of Rev. Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr., Ph.D. (Leipzig), of Nantucket, upon "The Development of the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Roman See till the End of the Pontificate of Nicholas I (867)."

The Conference Committee then reported that they had met a committee of the Council of the American Historical Association, consisting of Dr. Justin Winsor, Professor George B. Adams, and Professor Herbert B. Adams, who had accepted the proposed plan of union without modification,

and agreed to recommend its adoption by the Association.[1]

As the Rev. Dr. R. S. Storrs would deliver his address as President of the American Historical Association, at 8 P.M., it was unanimously voted to take a recess until the next morning.

On Wednesday at 10 A.M. the Society reconvened. The following papers were read: by Professor Allan Clapp Thomas of Haverford College, upon "The Attitude of the Society of Friends towards Slavery in the Eighteenth Century;" by Rev. Dr. Edward Tanjore Corwin, of Greendale, N. Y., upon "The Amsterdam Correspondence"; by the Rev. Dr. Ezra Hoyt Byington, of Newton, Mass., upon "John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians"; by the Secretary, the paper by the Rev. Dr. Joseph Henry Allen, of Cambridge, Mass., upon "The Ecclesiastical Situation in New England prior to the Revolution." There were remarks upon these papers by the President, Dr. Good, Bishop Hurst, Dr. Tiffany, and Mr. Faulkner.

The President appointed during the session, as the nominating committee upon the officers of the Church History section called for by the Plan of Union, Dr. Richardson, Dr. Emerton, and the Secretary. The Committee reported at the close of the session in favor of Dr. Fisher as chairman, and Dr. Jackson as secretary; and the report was unanimously adopted, and the persons named declared elected to their respective offices.

On invitation of the Treasurer and Secretary, the members in attendance then lunched together at the City Club.

At 3.30 P.M. the Society reconvened for its final session. The following papers were read: by Professor Dana Carleton Munro, of the University of Pennsylvania, upon "The Attitude of the Western Church towards the Study of the Latin Classics in the Early Middle Ages"; by the Rev. John Alfred Faulkner, of Binghamton, N. Y., upon "Wesley as a Churchman"; by the Rev. Bartlett Burleigh James, of Washington, D. C., upon "The Colony of the Labadists in Maryland."

[1] This was done at the final session of the Association, Dec. 31, 1896, and the plan was unanimously adopted.

The first paper was discussed by Rev. J. Ritchie Smith, Dr. Richardson, Dr. Paine, and Rev. Mr. Haas.

With the adoption of the following resolutions, the American Society of Church History terminated its separate existence:

(1) That the thanks of the Society be tendered to the President and Trustees of Columbia University for their generous hospitality, and to the Treasurer and Secretary of this Society for entertaining the members at luncheon.

(2) That the disposition of any funds in the Treasury of the American Church History Society, and the collection and disposition of amounts now due the Society by members and others, be lodged with the present Secretary and the Treasurer, to be used on behalf of the Society and its members at their discretion.

(3) That the American Society of Church History, at this its final session, Wednesday afternoon, Dec. 30, 1896, extends to the Rev. Professor Samuel Macauley Jackson, D.D., LL.D., Secretary of the Society, a cordial vote of thanks and appreciation for his unselfish and zealous labors on behalf of the Society, from its foundation in 1888 to its merging in the American Historical Association in 1896, during which period he has filled the office of Secretary to the very great profit of the Society and to the utmost satisfaction of its members; and also heartily thanks Mr. Barr Ferree, its Treasurer, for his three years of faithful service and admirable work on behalf of the Society.

The following members partook of the luncheon at the City Club: George P. Fisher, Edward T. Corwin, John B. Drury, Ernest C. Richardson, Jas. Dallas Steele, John A. W. Haas, Ezra H. Byington, Barr Ferree, L. L. Paine, C. C. Tiffany, Jno. Alfred Faulkner, J. Ritchie Smith, Dana Carleton Munro, M. J. Cramer, A. C. McGiffert, Henry M. Mac Cracken, John F. Hurst, Samuel Macauley Jackson.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON,
Secretary.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

By Rev. THOMAS CARY JOHNSON, D.D.,

Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Policy in Union Theological Seminary, Hampden Sidney, Va., and author of *A History of the Southern Presbyterian Church*, etc.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	*Some Literature on the United Synod*	3
II.	*General Statement*	6
III.	*The Source of the United Synod*	7
IV.	*The Organization of the United Synod*	15
V.	*The History of the United Synod during its Existence as a Separate Church*	24
VI.	*The Union with the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America*	26
VII.	*No New School Party in the Southern Presbyterian Church of To-Day*	37

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

By the Rev. THOMAS CARY JOHNSON, D.D.,

Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity in Union Theological Seminary, Hampden Sidney, Virginia.

CHAPTER I.

LITERATURE ON THE UNITED SYNOD.

1. *On the Source of the United Synod.*

Alexander, W. A. *A Digest of the Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, from its organization to the Assembly of 1887, inclusive, with Certain Historical Notes.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1888.

Baird, S. J. *A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church, from its Origin in America to the Present Time. With Notes and Documents Explanatory and Historical: Constituting a complete illustration of her polity, faith, and history.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1855.

——— *A History of the New School and of the Questions Involved in the Disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1838.* Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen and Haffelfinger, 1868.

General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, N. S.: *Minutes, 1830–1839 and 1840–1870.*

Gillet, Ezra Hall. *History of the Presbyterian Church*

in the United States of America. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee, 1864. Revised edition, Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1873.

HAYS, GEORGE P. *Presbyterians: A Popular Narrative of their Origin, Progress, Doctrines, and Achievements. With special Chapters by the Rev. W. J. Reid, D.D., et al. Introduction by the Rev. John Hall, D.D., LL.D.,* and *the Rev. William E. Moore, D.D., LL.D.* New York: J. M. Hill & Co., 1892.

MOORE, WILLIAM E. *The Presbyterian Digest. A Compend of the Acts and Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Compiled by the Order and Authority of the General Assembly.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1873.

NEVIN, ALFRED. *Encyclopedia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, including the Northern and Southern Assemblies.* Philadelphia, 1884.

"The Presbyterian," for the years *1837* and *1838.* Published by William S. Martien, S.E. corner Seventh and George Streets, Philadelphia.

THOMPSON, ROBERT ELLIS. *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States* (in the "American Church History" Series). New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895.

WOODS, JAMES. *Facts and Observations concerning the Organization of the Churches of the three Synods of Western New York and the Western Reserve.* Saratoga, 1837.

——— *Old and New Theology; Also a Review of Beeman on the Atonement.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1845.

II. *On the Organization and Subsequent History of the United Synod.*

ALEXANDER, W. A. *A Digest,* etc. (See p. 3.)

CAROTHERS, A. G. Private letter to Dr. A. H. H. Boyd, dated June 16, 1857.

"Central Presbyterian." For 1863 and 1864. Published at Richmond, Va.

DABNEY, R. L., D.D., LL.D. Private Letter to Thomas Cary Johnson, dated September 30, 1895.

THE DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, COMMONLY CALLED THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, *as set forth in the formal declarations and illustrated by the extracts from the proceedings of the General Assembly, from 1861–70; to which is added extracts from the Proceedings of the O. S. Assembly from 1861–67; and of the New School Assembly, from 1861–66.* Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1870.

DUNNING, H. (Washington, D. C.). Private letter to A. H. H. Boyd (Winchester, Va.), dated June 23, 1857.

MINUTES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, SOUTH, *1861–1864.*

MINUTES OF THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *1858 to 1863.*

MINUTES (manuscript copy) OF THE SYNOD OF VIRGINIA (N. S.), 1856 to 1864.

MITCHELL, J. D., D.D. Private letters to Dr. A. H. H. Boyd, dated June 9 and July 16, 1857.

PRICE, THE REV. P. B. (of Buchanan, Va.). Private letter to Thomas Cary Johnson, dated December 10, 1895.

POSITION, RELATION, AND PROSPECTS OF THE UNITED SYNOD IN REFERENCE TO THE MORAL ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE PRESENT WAR. Adopted by the Synod of Virginia, October 25, 1862. Richmond: Printed by Charles H. Wynne, 1863.

"Southern Presbyterian Review," April, 1864.

SMITH, J. C. (Washington, D. C.). Private letters to Dr. A. H. H. Boyd, dated June 23, July 4, and July 16, 1837.

TUCKER, HON. J. R. (Lexington, Va.). Private letter to Thomas Cary Johnson, dated October 8, 1895.

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL ACCOUNT.

THE United Synod was organized during the years 1857 and 1858. Its membership was altogether Southern. It was composed of Presbyteries and Churches which, up to 1857, had been in connection with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, New School. After its organization as an independent body, it maintained separate existence until 1864. In that year it united with the "Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America." The body into which the United Synod had thus debouched, had been formed in 1861 by the Presbyteries and Churches previously constituting a part of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Old School. In 1865 it changed its name to "The Presbyterian Church in the United States." It is popularly known as the "Southern Presbyterian Church."

We propose in the following paper, to set forth more particularly: *first*, the source of the United Synod in the New School body; *second*, the organization of the Synod as an independent ecclesiastical body; *third*, its growth, and the development of its several agencies, during the period of its separate existence; *fourth*, its union with the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, which, for convenience, we shall usually refer to as "The Southern Presbyterian Church"; and *finally*, the results of this union observable in the united body.

CHAPTER III.

THE SOURCE OF THE UNITED SYNOD.

In 1838 the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America split into two bodies mutually independent. One of the resulting bodies bore the popular designation of "The Old School Presbyterian Church"; the other was similarly called "The New School Presbyterian Church."

The predisposing causes of the division had been several. 1. Doctrinal "unsoundness" in many ministers of the New School party and the toleration of that "unsoundness" by a large element in the undivided church. 2. Continuous departure from the Presbyterian polity, by the substitution in our church courts for regularly elected and ordained elders the delegates of the Congregational system. 3. The effort was also made by the New School element to prevent the development of the Church's peculiar agencies for the education of the ministry, for the conduct of the foreign and domestic missions, and so forth. They preferred to support corresponding voluntary societies already in existence and, for the most part, under the control of the New England Congregationalists—such societies, for instance, as the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and the American Education Society.

These causes themselves may be traced, in greatest part, to the adoption of the Plan of Union of 1801, the original parties to which were the General Association of Connecticut and the Presbyterian General Assembly. The *Plan* was intended for application in the new settlements of the country wherein resided both Congregationalists and Presbyterians. According to *it*, a congregation of either denomination, or

one composed in part of members of one persuasion, and in part of members of the other, could call a minister of either; and the discipline of these congregations might be administered according to the preferred polity of the offender and the prosecutor, or in case of their inability to agree as to the form of polity under which the case should be conducted, by a council composed of Presbyterians and Congregationalists in equal numbers.[1]

This was an illustration and practical application of the broadest broad-churchism.

Under the operation of the Plan no less than four considerable Synods, with *quasi*-Presbyteries came into existence. They were a mighty power working for the virtual abolition of Presbyterian rule and for latitudinarian doctrines. In many of these *quasi*-Presbyteries the conditions of ordination were very much more lax than in the majority of the real Presbyteries. However, it is to be observed that in accord with, and perhaps to some degree in consequence of, the latitudinarian act of the Assembly in establishing the Plan of Union, many of the old and genuine Presbyteries were showing laxity in the reception of new members.

By these agencies—the *quasi*-Presbyteries and some lax Presbyteries under the lead of theologians and ecclesiastics who had drunk deeply of New England Theology—many men of views very unacceptable to the Old School party were brought into the Church. The new-comers not only made themselves at home; they undertook to reconstruct the body into which they had come. Hence, that threefold war on the Church—war on her old-fashioned Covenant and Calvinistic theology, war on her Presbyterian polity, and war on her developing agencies. Hence, also, the split of 1838.

Irenical historians try to belittle the differences between the Old and New School parties prior to the division. Especially do they minimize the differences in theological doctrine. But their effort is futile. In the language of the moderate as well as "courtly and diplomatic" Dr. Samuel

[1] Baird's *Digest*, pp. 570, *ff*.

Miller, of Princeton, "If *Pelagian* and *semi-Pelagian* sentiments existed in the *fifth century*, here they are in all their unquestionable and revolting features. More particularly in regard to the denial of *Original Sin* and the assertion of the doctrine of *human ability*, Pelagius and his followers never went further than some of the advocates of the doctrines above recited. To attempt to persuade us to the contrary, is to suppose that the record of the published language and opinions of those ancient heretics is lost or forgotten."[1] Dr. Lyman Beecher in his "Sermon on the Native Character of Man"; Mr. Finney in his "Sermons on Important Subjects"; Mr. Duffield in his book on *Regeneration*—each of whom was a light in the New School party—taught the Pelagian doctrine of Sin.[2] Nor had these men a small body of sympathizers in matters of doctrine. Many of the ministers of the New School party had been educated in New England, and were the theological disciples of Hopkins, and Taylor of New Haven. They naturally, therefore, held and taught many other theological doctrines than Pelagian and semi-Pelagian doctrines of sin, which were sorely displeasing to the Old School party in the Church. Nor were the New England Schools the only fountains of such doctrines. The natural heart is Pelagian. And it is notorious that some of the leaders of the New School thought were not from New England institutions.

But while it is a well attested fact that among the leaders of the New School party there were many who favored an anti-Calvinistic theology; and while it is equally certain that they had a considerable body of sympathetic followers among the New School ministers, it is also fair to say that there was a good deal of only apparently Arminian teaching by New School men who were really Calvinistic. In times of such conflicts men tend to emphasize one set of truths at the expense of others. Dr. Lyman Beecher was charged by Dr. Porter with exalting "*human agency* so as virtually to

[1] From Dr. Miller's letters to Presbyterians, quoted on page 55 of *Old and New School Theology*, by Jas. Wood, D.D.

[2] Compare Jas. Wood, *Old and New School Theology*, pages 64, *ff*.

lose sight of human dependence." In his reply, among other things he said: "The preaching of dependence by hyper-Calvinists has been so disproportioned, as to require the reiterated inculcation of free agency and ability, to obviate prejudice, gain a hearing, and give the relative proportions of truth to minds accustomed to disproportionate and distorted views."[1] These bold words from the adroit apologist may not avail to make us regard him, the avowed sympathizer with Taylorism, as a thorough-going Calvinist; but they may suggest an explanation of preaching so one-sided as to look Arminian, though really Calvinistic.

Nor must it be forgotten that for other reasons, subsequently to be hinted at, many went with the New School Party who did not even appear to have any sort of sympathy with the New Theology current among the leaders of the party and their more immediate followers.

Even ironical historians commonly assert that the Old School party was justly aroused by the incessant attacks made upon the Church's polity by the New School leaders. New School broad-churchism was about to be followed by utter subversion of Presbyterianism and the erection of practical Congregationalism. And if it is certain that her polity was endangered, it is no less an admitted fact that the New School party opposed the development of those agencies necessary in order to the Church's doing her own Foreign Mission, Home Mission, and Educational work.

The Assembly of 1837 had an Old School majority. It had a vivid impression of the dangers threatening the Church; and under a sense of these dangers abrogated the Plan of Union. And, not satisfied with that, it exscinded the four Synods which had come into existence on the basis of that plan. This was revolutionary action. The Old School party judged themselves justified in it, however, by the condition of affairs. They knew that it was revolutionary, but they believed that revolution alone could save the Church. But a large number of the rulers of the Church could not be made

[1] Dr. Beecher's reply to Dr. Porter's Letter in the *Presbyterian*, February 11, 1837.

to see that such measures were called for. They regarded the proceedings on the part of the Old School party in the Assembly as highhanded. Hence, many who had been neutral, and some who had inclined to the Old School, now aligned themselves with the New School as the wronged body. They went out with them when the secession occurred in 1838; and that too after equally highhanded measures had been employed by the New School party in their endeavors to capture the Assembly previous to their withdrawal. They could excuse the party of their choice on account of their provocations of the past year. Thus many went out with the party who had no sympathy with the New Theology; and no sympathy with the effort to substitute the Congregational for the Presbyterian polity; and as little with the effort to smother the Church's own missionary and other agencies by independent voluntary societies.

The New School party, now a separate denominational organization, seems to have been sobered by the schism it had made. It became nervous lest it should appear to the world generally to be un-Presbyterian and un-Calvinistic. It paid earnest attention to Presbyterianizing the four Congregational Synods. It stopped talking about replacing the Westminster Confession of Faith by a short Creed destitute of Calvinism. It developed the agencies for its own body, the like to which in the undivided Church it had fought in the interest of voluntary societies. And there were some significant departures, as if in failure and disgust, of some of the more pronounced advocates of the distinctly New School views, out of the now reforming Church (New School) back to Congregationalism, or into other more congenial ecclesiastical climates.

Thus under a sense of deep responsibility, awakened by their schism itself to the consciousness of previous tendencies, and perhaps influenced to a degree by a somewhat High-Church spirit once more beginning to prevail in British and American Churches, the New School Church began to grow more Presbyterian, more churchly, and more Calvinistic.

Yet it was slow in becoming uniformly Presbyterian throughout its bounds; while Semi-Pelagian and kindred doctrines continued to maintain themselves among part of the ministers and elders.

For several years the growth of the New School body was slow. Its first work was to effect its organization. Subsequently it entered upon a course of relatively rapid expansion. But the body was destined itself to division.

In the first New School Assembly, that of 1838, memorials were presented on the subject of slavery. Owing to the pressure of other questions, however, they were withdrawn.

But in 1839, in 1840, in 1843, in 1846, in 1850, in 1851, in 1852, in 1853, in 1856, and in 1857, the Assemblies of the Church discussed slavery with ever-increasing warmth. The Assembly of 1846 resolved that "The system of slavery as it exists in these United States, viewed either in the laws of the several States which sanction it, or in the actual operation and results in society, is intrinsically an unrighteous and oppressive system, and is opposed to the prescriptions of the law of God, to the spirit and precepts of the Gospel, and to the best interests of humanity."[1] The Assembly of 1849 resolved, "That it is the 'duty of all Christians who enjoy the light of the present day,' to use their honest, earnest, and unwearied endeavors, as speedily as possible to efface this blot on our holy religion, and to obtain the complete abolition of slavery throughout Christendom, and, if possible, throughout the world. This General Assembly do most solemnly exhort all under our care to perform this duty, and to be ever ready to make all necessary sacrifices in order to effect a consummation so much to be desired."[2] In 1850 the Assembly resolved, "That the holding our fellow-men in the condition of slavery, except in those cases where it is unavoidable, by the laws of the State, the obligations of guardianship, or the demands of humanity, is an *offence* in the proper import of that term, as used in the Book of Discipline, Chap. I., sec. 3, and should be regarded

[1] *Minutes of General Assembly* (*N. S.*), 1846, pp. 28, 29.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1849, p. 187, 188.

and treated in the same manner as other offences."[1] The same Assembly then "referred the whole subject of slavery as it exists in the Church . . . to the Sessions and Presbyteries to take such action thereon as in their judgment the laws of Christianity require."[2]

In 1855 a committee was appointed to report to the Assembly of 1856 "on the Constitutional power of the Assembly over the subject of slaveholding in our churches."[3] The Assembly of 1856 followed in the wake of preceding Assemblies in treating slavery as an offence in the sense in which the term is used in the Book of Discipline, though it is not stated to be such in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church. Yet while ready thus to make law in an illegal way, it was not ready to trample on the constitution by undertaking to discipline slave-holders by an immediate process, and in disregard of the plainly marked prerogatives of the lower courts.

Matters now, however, were rapidly approaching a crisis. The actions of the Assemblies referred to had not been unanimous. Protests had been entered repeatedly by a small minority, chiefly of Southern members. The Southern Presbyteries did not take the Assembly's view of the relation of slavery; and the Assembly of 1857 received "official notice" that at least one of these Presbyteries proposed to disregard the Assembly's position as unscriptural. Therefore the Assembly expresses its deep grief "That a portion of the Church at the South has so far departed from the established doctrines of the Church in relation to slavery, as to maintain that 'it is an ordinance of God,' and that the system of slavery existing in the United States is natural and right." Against this new doctrine it says, further, "we feel constrained to bear our solemn testimony. It is at war with the whole spirit and tenor of the Gospel of love and good will, as well as abhorrent to the conscience of the Christian world. We can have no sympathy or fellowship with it; and we expect all our people to eschew it as serious and pernicious error.

[1] *Minutes of General Assembly* (*N. S.*), 1850, p. 325.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 325.
[3] *Ibid.*, 1856, p. 197.

"We are especially pained by the fact that the Presbytery of Lexington, South, have given official notice to us that a number of ministers and ruling elders, as well as many church members in their connection, hold slaves 'from principle' and 'of choice,' 'believing it to be according to the Bible right,' and have without any qualifying explanation, assumed the responsibility of sustaining such ministers, elders, and church members in their position. We deem it our duty, in the exercise of our constitutional authority, to bear testimony against error in doctrine, or immorality in practice, in any Church, Presbytery, or Synod to disprove and earnestly condemn the position which has been thus assumed by the Presbytery of Lexington, South, as one which is opposed to the established convictions of the Presbyterian Church, and must operate to mar its peace, and seriously hinder its prosperity, as well as bring a reproach on our holy religion; and we do hereby call on that Presbytery to review and rectify their position. Such doctrines and practices cannot be permanently tolerated in the Presbyterian Church." [1]

Against this action on the part of the Assembly twenty-two Southern ministers and elders entered a righteous protest on the following, among other grounds, viz.: that it was such an assertion of the sin of slavery as degraded the whole Southern Church; and that the assertion was not warranted by the Word of God nor by the organic law of the Presbyterian body; that the act under the current conditions had *virtually exscinded the South; and that such indirect excision* was unrighteous, oppressive, and uncalled for, a usurpation, and destructive of the unity of their Church.[2]

The Southern brethren justly looked on the Assembly as having made law additional to the Bible and contra-Biblical; and as having judged them as unworthy of fellowship because they were not ready to receive and apply this new doctrine—as usurping the prerogatives of the great head of the Church who is her sole legislator. Thenceforth they could contemplate but one course in relation to their Assembly, viz.: to withdraw all connection with it.

[1] *Minutes of General Assembly (N. S.)*, 1857, pp. 403, 404. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 406.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED SYNOD.

In May, 1857, the Southern delegates of the Assembly at Cleveland, Ohio, "Felt themselves constrained, for truth and conscience' sake, to withdraw together from that body, and to recommend" a convention of the Southern Brethren to be held during the following summer. Their design in petitioning for a convention was to secure concerted and harmonious action on the part of all the Presbyteries, in formally withdrawing all connection with the Assembly, and taking the necessary measures in order to the erection of a new church, or pursuing such other course as might seem good. With a view to winning the "Presbytery of the District of Columbia," Washington, D. C., was at first pitched upon as the place for the Convention. It was called to meet there in August. But from the start the pastors in Washington seem to have been unanimously opposed to the Convention *being held in that city. They fought holding it in* Washington, on the ground that in August most of the pastors of the place were absent from their charges, and upon the more intelligible ground that they disapproved of the calling of the Convention at all. This Presbytery grew rapidly in antagonism to the secession of the Southern brethren. Drs. Smith, Sunderland, and Mr. Carothers were at the boiling point of antagonism. Accordingly the place for the meeting of the Convention was changed to Richmond, Va. It met there on the 27th of August, 1857. It remained in session for five days. There were 152 members in attendance. The presiding officer was the Honorable Horace Maynard of Knoxville, Tenn. Other leading men in the Convention

were the Rev. Drs. A. H. H. Boyd of Winchester, Va., Frederick A. Ross of Huntsville, Ala., Charles Reed of Richmond, Va., J. C. Stiles of Richmond, Va., the Hon. John Randolph Tucker of Winchester, Va., and others. The spirit exhibited in all the discussions was very fine, and conversions are said to have attended the devotional exercises conducted by the members of the Convention.

There does not seem to have been any question in the Convention as to the propriety of withdrawing from the mother church. The constant agitation of the slavery question, and the Assembly's assuming, against the Constitution, to pronounce sentence of condemnation upon the lower judicatories or individuals prior to their being brought before it in the constitutionally prescribed mode, had provoked these men beyond the point of endurance. The time for discussing whether they should stay in the Assembly had passed. The business of the Convention was to determine on the proper course after withdrawal from the Assembly.

Before the Convention two great proposals were laid, viz.: One was to secede from the Northern New School Assembly and to form a separate and independent New School body. The other was for the seceding body to unite with the Old School Presbyterian Church. This latter proposal had strong advocacy. Mr. Tucker was a distinguished protagonist for the union with the Old School. But the views of his party were not destined to prevail in the Convention. Some men of foresight anticipated a struggle in the Old School body on the same question of slavery. Dr. Charles Read of Richmond said: The Old School Assembly has behaved well on the subject of slavery hitherto. But it is only from policy, not principle. It will soon be treating Southern Old School men as our Assembly has been treating us.[1] Some old war horses, too, could not forget their former hostilities. A few leaders who were unsound in doctrine, for that reason opposed uniting with the Old School. The Old School men were, moreover, cold and distant in bearing towards these perplexed New School brethren.

[1] Dr. Dabney's letter, September 30, 1895.

Such men as Dr. R. J. Breckenridge were insulting to the New School men who approached them on the subject of Union. The strongest antagonist of union in the convention was Dr. Boyd of Winchester. Says Mr. Tucker: "There was a strong sentiment in the direction of union, but the views presented with great ability by my old pastor and kinsman, the Rev. A. H. H. Boyd, D.D. in which he declared that with his views it would be impossible for him to unite with the Old School Church had great effect on the body, and the determination to secede from the Northern New School Church and to form a Synod of the South was determined upon." [1]

After a full and free discussion the following platform was adopted by the Convention:

"Whereas all acts, resolutions, and testimonies of past General Assemblies, and especially of the actions of the last General Assembly, whereby suspicions and doubts of the good standing and equal rights and privileges of slaveholding members of the Church, or imputations and charges against their Christian character, have been either implied or expressed, are contrary to the example and teaching of Christ and of his Apostles, and are a violating of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church.

"And whereas the relation of master and servant, *in itself considered*, or further than the relative duties arising therefrom, and slavery as an institution of the state, do not properly belong to the Church judicatories as subjects for discussion and inquiry.

"And whereas in the judgment of this Convention, there is no prospect for the cessation of this agitation of slavery in the General Assembly so long as there are slave holders in connection with the Church; therefore:

"*Resolved*, 1: That we recommend to the Presbyteries in connection with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to withdraw from said body.

"*Resolved*, 2: That in the judgment of this Convention nothing can be made the basis for discipline which is not specifically referred to in the constitution as crime or heresy.

[1] J. R. Tucker, private letter marked Lexington, Va., October 8, 1895.

"*Resolved*, 3: That the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church has no power to pronounce a sentence of condemnation on a lower judicatory, or on individuals for any cause unless they have been brought before the Assembly in the way prescribed by the constitution.

"*Resolved*, 4: That the Convention recommend to all the Presbyteries in the Presbyterian Church which are opposed to the agitation of slavery in the highest judicatory of the Church to appoint delegates in the proportion prescribed by our Form of Government for the appointment of commissioners to the Assembly, to meet at Knoxville, Tenn., on the third Thursday in May, 1858, for the purpose of organizing a general Synod, under the name of 'The United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.'[1]

"*Resolved*, 5: That the members of this convention adhere to and abide by the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, as containing the system of doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures; and that we adhere to the Form of Government and Book of Discipline of said Church."[2]

During the succeeding months the Synods and Presbyteries in the South, for the most part, acted upon the recommendation of the convention. The Synod of Virginia, for instance, at its meeting in Washington in the fall of 1857, passed the following resolutions, viz.:

"That the Synod of Virginia approve, as a whole, of the Resolutions adopted by the Convention of a portion of our Church, which lately met in Richmond, Va. And that we will cordially co-operate in the organization of the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church which is to meet in Knoxville, Tenn., on the first Thursday in April next."[3]

In further pursuance of the Convention's recommendations commissioners appointed by a number of Presbyteries met in the Second Presbyterian Church of Knoxville on

[1] Dr. J. D. Mitchell of Lynchburg, was advocating the use of the term Synod instead of *Assembly* as the name of the highest court of the Prospective Body as early as July, 1857. Private letter to Dr. A. H. H. Boyd, July 16, 1857.

[2] Alexander, *Digest*, p. 404. *Cp. The United Synod and the State of the Country*, pp. 6, 7.

[3] Written Records of the Synod of Virginia, p. 325.

April 1, 1858, and after a sermon by the Rev. Dr. J. D. Mitchell, of Lynchburg, Virginia, proceeded to constitute the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church.

There were twenty-one commissioners in attendance, from twelve Presbyteries, located in four different States. Among the more prominent ministers were the Revs. A. H. H. Boyd, D.D., Charles H. Read, D.D., J. D. Mitchell, and Frederick A. Ross, D.D.

Dr. Boyd was not behind the foremost of them in talent, culture, and Christian character. He had been born to an inheritance of one hundred thousand dollars. He had fine political prospects. All these he sacrificed for the ministry, in which he most liberally used his fortune, giving freely to various objects.[1] He had trained himself not only by study at home but by a course of study abroad. And such was the sprightliness, acuteness, balance, and vigor of his mind that he was regarded as the best equipped debater in either Church on theological topics.[2] He possessed also moral intrepidity in the highest degree. Dr. Charles Read was a fine ecclesiastic, an instructive preacher, a vigorous writer, and an affable gentleman. Dr. Mitchell was best known for his evangelistic work. Dr. Frederick A. Ross was brilliant, but erratic, widely known but not influential in his Church relations, without power as an ecclesiastic or a theologian.

Dr. Read was elected the Moderator of this first United Synod.

After the election of the other necessary officers a motion was adopted that this body should be styled, "The United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." This act was followed almost immediately by one declaring, "That this United Synod do adhere to and abide by the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and that we adhere to the Form of Government, and Book of Discipline of said Church."[3] Later on steps

[1] Rev. P. B. Price, letter marked Buchanan, Dec. 10, 1895.
[2] Hon. J. R. Tucker, letter marked Lexington, Va., Oct. 8, 1895.
[3] *Minutes of the United Synod*, 1858, p. 5.

were taken to make the slight changes in the Standards rendered necessary by the chosen name of the Supreme Court of the Church just setting up; and to increase the size of the United Synod by changing the numerical basis of representation—one ministerial commission to every six ministers in the Presbyteries.[1]

Among the most important acts of this Synod was the adoption of a *declaration of principles* which set forth the reasons for withdrawing from the General Assembly and forming a separate ecclesiastical body, and which were, in their judgment, "in accordance with the Word of God, and the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, and essential to the peace, unity, and permanent prosperity of the Presbyterian Church in this land." The substance of the Declaration is as follows:

1. They declare their agreement in and approbation of the standards of faith, polity, and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in these United States; and they state in what sense they adopt the Confession of Faith, viz.: That of "the Adopting Act of 1729."

2. They assert that it is a fundamental principle of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, "That no judicatory, minister, or private member, can be censured, condemned, or excluded from Church privileges" without a process of trial such as is prescribed in the Constitution.

3–5. They affirm that according to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church the General Assembly is an advisory and judicial body, and has no legislative power in the proper acceptation of the term; and that, therefore, this United Synod "disclaims the right to legislate or make laws upon any subject that will be binding upon the lower judicatories, or upon any portion of the Presbyterian Church," that "Presbyterians profess to be governed by *Constitutional Law* as it is developed in the Confession of Faith, and not by the opinion of a Presbytery, or a Session, or a Synod, or General Assembly, further than they act in a judicial capacity with respect to matters distinctly

[1] *Minutes of the United Synod*, 1858, p. 13.

referred to in the said Confession"; that "a departure from this principle, and the recognition of the right of an Ecclesiastical judicatory to decide what is heresy or crime, when there is no allusion in the Confession of Faith to that which is so regarded, would be tantamount to making the judicatory, instead of the Confession of Faith, the standard of truth and morality, and as the decision of one judicatory cannot bind another, there might be as many different opinions in reference to the supposed heresy or crime, as there are judicatories in the Church; that "The United Synod, therefore, deny the right of any judicatory of the Presbyterian Church to make anything the subject of discipline" which is not made so by the standards taken according to the "manifest intent" of the framers.

6. They maintain that "as slaveholding or the relation between master and slave, is not referred to in the Standards either directly or indirectly as an offence, it cannot *in itself considered* in any case be made the basis of discipline in the Presbyterian Church."

7. They declare that it is usurpation of authority for any court to make slaveholding a bar to Communion.

8. That as Jesus Christ and his apostles did not intimate that slaveholding was sinful and did not remove slaveholders from the Church by legislation or by testifying against it; and further that as the system of slavery is an institution of the State,[1] the discussion or agitation of slavery in the judicatories of the Church, except so far as respects the moral and religious duties growing out of the relation of master and slave, is inappropriate to said judicatories; and is to be excluded from the Church courts.

9. They invite Presbyterians *from every section of the Union* to cast in their lot with them.[2]

In response to recommendations of the Richmond Convention that the Synod when formed and duly organized should invite the General Assembly (O. S.) to a fraternal

[1] *Minutes of the United Synod*, 1858, pp. 8 *et seq.*

[2] *The United Synod and the State of the Country*, pp. 7–10, and Alexander's *Digest*, p. 405.

conference on the subject of Union between itself and the Old School Church, the Synod appointed the Rev. Dr. C. H. Read and the Rev. M. M. Marshall to visit New Orleans and to confer with a committee of the Old School Assembly, in the event of that body's appointing one for the purpose, with reference to a union of the two bodies.[1] But for reasons to be indicated in the sequel that action found little favor in the Old School Assembly.

This Synod also took steps looking to obtaining from the Legislature of Tennessee a suitable charter in order to secure to itself "all the rights and immunities possessed by the General Assembly in the United States."[2]

It recommended "to the Presbyteries the necessity for a Theological Seminary to be under its care," leaving the Presbyteries themselves to determine "through the Synod all things pertaining thereto."[3] It appointed permanent committees to take charge of its educational work and its work of church erection; and it established a "Board of Missions" to conduct its foreign missionary interests, and to "*sustain missions amongst our slaves.*"

At this time there were already in existence in the Synod of Virginia "a domestic missionary board, styled the "Domestic Missionary Society of Hanover and Piedmont Presbyteries, and also a Committee of Foreign Missions, both actually and successfully carrying on missionary work in their respective fields. These agencies had each expressed a desire to become organs of the United Synod. Accordingly the Synod erected "a Board of Missions to consist of all the members of the Board of Domestic Missions of Hanover and Piedmont Presbyteries, and of the Committee of Foreign Missions, and of one minister and ruling elder from each Presbytery in the connection." This Committee was to be styled "*The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Board of the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.*"

[1] Alexander's *Digest*, p. 405. *Minutes United Synod*, 1858, pp. 14, 15.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

The Executive Committee of the Board was to consist of the members of the former Presbyterial Board and of the old Committee on Foreign Missions. Further measures were taken looking to securing the united action of the Church in mission work.

Thus the new Church equipped itself for work along with other bodies of God's people. Its beginning was modest, but not unworthy.

CHAPTER V.

THE GROWTH OF THE SYNOD AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITS SEVERAL AGENCIES DURING THE PERIOD OF SEPARATE EXISTENCE.

BEFORE the meeting of the United Synod, in 1859, two other Presbyteries were ready for reception into the body. The minutes of that year, accordingly, show that the Synods and Presbyteries embraced in the United Synod were as follows:

I. Synod of Virginia—Presbyteries: Winchester, District of Columbia (?) Hanover, Piedmont.

II. Synod of Tennessee—Presbyteries: Union, Holston, Kingston, and New River.

III. Synod of Mississippi—Presbyteries: North Alabama, Clinton, Lexington South, Newton, Texas, Osage.

The Synod of the South had in connection with itself at this time 108 ministers, 187 churches, 8 licentiates, 27 candidates for the ministry, and 10,877 communicants.[1] In 1861 it had in connection with it 121 ministers, 199 churches, 4 licentiates, 18 candidates for the ministry, and 11,581 communicants. It continued to enjoy a measure of growth in 1862, but the conditions of the Church's environments—in which war was stalking furiously—forbade any rapid progress. In 1864 there were about 120 ministers, 190 churches, 12,000 communicants.

In 1859 an important change was made in the Board of Missions. Its members were reduced to eighteen, five of

[1] *Minutes of United Synod*,, 1859, p. 90. The figures as stated in the Minutes are larger, owing to counting the Presbytery of the District of Columbia, which never joined the United Synod.

whom should constitute a quorum, and one third of whom should go out of office annually but be eligible for reëlection. The Board was thus reduced to a more efficient size and it was properly subordinated to the Church. It continued while possible to support the one Foreign Missionary of the Synod—Mr. Kalopothakes. He had been sent two years before by the Virginia Committee on Foreign Missions. As time passed, and owing to the fortunes of war it became impossible for the Board to care for Mr. Kalopothakes, he was committed to the American and Foreign Christian Union. The Rev. P. B. Price, of Richmond, Va., remained the devoted Secretary of the Board.

In addition to aiding candidates in securing an education, the Church gave attention to efforts to establish educational institutions. Maryville College was turned over to the United Synod by the Synod of Tennessee in 1859. And the next year the Rev. J. J. Robinson, D.D., its president, was appointed financial agent.

Steps were taken in 1859, also, for the founding of a Theological Seminary. The Seminary was to be located in the "vicinity of the University of Virginia." One hundred thousand dollars were to "be raised for the purpose of providing the necessary buildings and library, and of endowing not less than three professorships, each professorship to have an endowment of not less than $25,000.[1] The Synod elected a Board of Directors, a Professor of Systematic and Pastoral Theology, and ordered its Board of Directors "to elect a professor of Ecclesiastical History and Biblical Literature as soon as the endowment fund subscribed" should amount to $50,000.[2] The Rev. Jos. C. Stiles, D.D., was chosen the Professor of Theology. In 1860 over $70,000 had been subscribed and partly paid in. After the Union with the Old Church South, such money as had been paid toward the Theological Seminary was for the most part diverted to Hampden Sidney College.

[1] *Minutes of United Synod*, 1859, pp. 54, 55.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

CHAPTER VI.

THE UNION WITH THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA.

WE have already seen that in the Richmond Convention there was a strong party of the New School in favor of union with the Old School Church of the country; and that the Constituting Synod at Knoxville, in 1858, sent a committee to the Old School Assembly then in session at New Orleans, to confer with a similar committee of the Old School, if such should be appointed, concerning organic union. "This committee was directed to propose certain terms as indispensable to an honorable union on the part of the United Synod. These terms were seven in number, being in the main a repetition of the position above given in the Declaration of Principles." One term asked was that both bodies agree that it is consistent with the requirements of the Westminster Confession to receive said Confession according to the Adopting Act of 1729. Another was that the examinations should be relaxed in the reception of ministers from the United Synod.[1]

The Assembly appointed the Rev. C. Van Rensalaer, D.D., the Rev. B. M. Palmer, D.D., and the Rev. Mr. Cunningham a committee to meet and confer with the committee of the United Synod.

This Assembly's committee subsequently laid before the body the "terms of union" submitted by the United Synod, and also its proposal to establish mutual correspondence between the two bodies in case union should not be determined on, with the recommendation that they should

[1] Alexander's *Digest*, p. 405.

be put upon the docket. This was done. When the matter came before the body for consideration, the Rev. R. J. Breckenridge submitted a paper which was unanimously adopted. In this paper the Assembly said that the official papers from the United Synod did not afford a basis of conference on which it was able to see that there was any prospect of advancing the interest of Christ's Kingdom, in general, or those of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, or those of the United Synod in particular. The Assembly further expressed itself as thinking that the acceptance of terms would appear to involve a condemnation of itself and the renunciation of the rich and peculiar favor of God upon it in the matters which had led to the secession of the New School body from it twenty years before.[1] There are with individuals often reasons for a given course of actions which they will not give, as well as reasons which they do give. And individuals are not peculiar in this respect. Corporate bodies are often quite as much influenced by unnamed reasons as by those offered. Such was the case of the Old School Church in the present instance. She was not only tenacious of reputation for strict construction in theology, she had in the main kept clear of partisan and Un-Biblical discussion of the relation of slavery. She did not propose to excite such discussions at once by taking into her own communion a body with such a history as the United Synod had.

After the split of the Old School Church in 1861, on occasion of the Spring Resolutions, one barrier, therefore, to union between Old School South and New School South was gone. The Old School South felt too, her loneliness, albeit she was the greatest body of Presbyterians in what were then the Confederate States; and in her first Assembly, December, 1861, expressed her earnest desire for a cordial union with all those who agreed with her in doctrinal principles and Church polity.[2] Southern Old School men had never

[1] *Minutes General Assembly* (*O. S.*), 1858, pp. 289, 290. *Cp.* Alexander's *Digest*, p. 405. *Minutes of United Synod*, 1859, pp. 46, 47.

[2] *Minutes General Assembly, South*, pp. 36, 37.

been suspicious of any widespread doctrinal unsoundness in the Southern segment of the New School body. A few New School ministers were known to hold distinctive New School doctrines, or at least doctrines distinctly hostile to Old School Theology, and freely tolerated in the New School party. But these men might have been counted on the fingers of one hand, perhaps. Dr. J. D. Mitchell preached now Arminianism and now Calvinism. He was very inconsistent; but without doubt believed that his theology differed from the Old School. In a letter to Dr. A. H. H. Boyd of Winchester, Va.,[1] he referred to his Church's having for its doctrinal basis an *unlimited atonement*.[2] Dr. A. H. H. Boyd held a view of the atonement akin to that taught by Dr. John Brown of the Secession Church in Scotland—a view that the atonement was for all in such a sense as that all *may have life*.[3] He was, says Dr. Dabney, "frankly a semi-Pelagian." To anticipate, when the time came for his Synod to discuss the Articles of Union between the United Synod and the Presbyterian Church Old School South, Dr. Boyd said *substantially:* "The articles are thoroughly Calvinistic; though stated with moderation they do not express my theology. But you ought to accept them and join the Southern Church Old School. The difficulties of your position dictate such a course. I know that I am in a small minority, even in my own United Synod. I do not wish to hamper the Synod by obtruding my peculiar views."[4] When Dr. Frederick A. Ross taught Arminianism it was probably from lack of

[1] The letter is marked Lynchburg, Va., June 9, 1857, and is the property of Mr. E. Holmes Boyd, Winchester, Va.

[2] The Rev. Prof. Dr. C. R. Vaughan says that Dr. Mitchell did not know what he believed, that sometimes his preaching was so Arminian that his New School elders would remonstrate with him; that on such occasions Dr. Mitchell would express his surprise that he had been preaching anything but good Calvinism; would propose to make reparation on the first opportunity, and would on his next appointment retract everything Arminian and preach a very good Calvinistic discourse. The truth is that Dr. Mitchell was a man of feeling and impulse rather than intellect.

[3] See *Central Presbyterian*, May 5, 1864.

[4] Letter from R. L. Dabney, marked Victoria, Texas, Sept. 30, 1895.

accurate knowledge. He did not know what he was doing; he seems to have regarded himself as a Calvinist.[1] The few other men who in its early years had been known for teaching New Theology were Northerners destined in the early years of the war to betake themselves North. This was the history of Dr. Arthur Mitchell of the Third Presbyterian Church, Richmond, Va. He was a disciple of Dr. Edwards A. Park of Andover.[2] But in 1861 he had gone back North. Other instances might be given of the flight of migratory birds to their Northern home. Thus the Church had been reduced to theological homogeneity of the Calvinistic type, with the exceptions named, and possibly a few others more obscure.

Indeed the New School people in the South seem never to have been generally charged with a prevalent leaning toward New School doctrines. They went with the New School party at the split of 1838 because of their friendship for New School men; because of the peculiar ecclesiastical moves of the Old School men, 1837–1838; and because of the extreme and unjustifiable representations made of the New School party by such men as Drs. Plummer and Breckenridge. The supposed wrongs of the New School party largely swelled their seceding ranks. Between 1861 and 1863 mutual confidence of the two bodies in one another grew. Especially among the "laity" and ruling elders desire for union was enkindled into a strong flame. Such men as John Randolph Tucker and Edwin Edmunds among the New School body; and J. T. L. Preston of Lexington, Va., and T. J. Kirkpatrick, of Lynchburg, Va., among the Old School, began to agitate for union. Such was the source of that desire for union which culminated in 1864 successfully.[3]

In 1863, the Assembly in session at Columbia was overtured to take such steps as its wisdom might suggest "to bring about a union between the Old and New School Pres-

[1] R. L. Dabney, letter marked Victoria, Texas, Sept. 30, 1895.
[2] P. B. Price, letter marked Buchanan, Va., Dec. 10, 1895.
[3] *Minutes Assembly (O. S.) South*, 1863, p. 137.

byterians in the Confederate States,"[1] In response the Assembly recognized the fact that union between these bodies "had engaged the earnest attention of a large number of our ministers and people, especially in the regions in which the respective parties are brought into most frequent contact with each other." It expressed its sense that probably the time for union had approached near, and that owing to their common afflictions both the parties concerned had been brought into that condition in which union could be profitably discussed. Finally, with a view of ascertaining whether such a union could be formed upon any basis that "should be satisfactory to both parties" and "should offer reasonable grounds of hope for permanent harmony and cooperation," it appointed a committee to confer on the subject with any committee that should be appointed by the United Synod, and report the result of such a conference to the next Assembly.[2]

The gentlemen appointed on this Committee were the Rev. R. L. Dabney, D.D., Rev. J. N. Waddel, D.D., Rev. Wm. Brown, D.D., Rev. J. B. Ramsey, D.D., Rev. E. T. Baird, D.D., Col. J. T. L. Preston, and F. N. Watkins.[3]

In like manner the United Synod of 1863 was overtured and memorialized to take steps looking toward union with the Old School Church South; and the Synod appointed a committee "to arrange for such a formal union of the Presbyterian Churches of the South, upon the basis of the Confession of Faith, as in its spirit and terms" should be "honorable and acceptable and as in its provisions and arrangements" should "promise the enlarged prosperity of Christ's Kingdom within our respective bounds," and to report to the Synod the results of the fraternal conference at its next annual meeting. The members of this Committee were the Rev. Joseph C. Stiles, D.D., Rev. Charles H. Read, D.D., Rev. J. D. Mitchell, D.D., Rev. J. J. Robinson, D.D., and Elder J. F. Johnston.

[1] *Cp.* Col. Preston's speech (in *Central Presbyterian*, Nov. 10, 1864).
[2] *Minutes Gen. Assembly, South*, 1863, p. 137 *ff.*
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

In July, 1863, the committees of the bodies met in Lynchburg, Va. After prayer the two committees were informally resolved into one interlocutory committee. For a little while there was a constrained silence. Then Dr. R. L. Dabney rose with "shoulders shrugged up" and "both hands in his breeches pockets," "trying to look as much like a clod-hopper," says Dr. McGuffey, "as he could." He began: "Well brethren, as nobody seems ready, I would like to try to talk a little." He then went on, continued Dr. McGuffey, "and made the most adroit speech possible and one of the best I ever heard from him." Dr. J. C. Stiles then rose and said that if the magnificent justice outlined by Dr. Dabney prevailed in his General Assembly, every obstacle to union was removed; and so forth.

The discussion which followed was conciliatory. And as a result the two committees concurred in recommending to the Southern Assembly and the United Synod a plan of union embracing two great features, viz.: 1st, A brief doctrinal declaration clearing up the supposed differences of doctrine on the essential points of Calvinistic and Covenant Theology.[1] 2d, A statement of a plan for consolidating the Synods and Presbyteries and such congregations as might desire it without disturbing any property rights, pastoral relations, or ministerial standing in the united Presbyteries.

That Dr. Dabney wrote the doctrinal article was enough to give assurance that it was characterized by a strong and thoroughgoing Calvinism. In a certain quarter of the Church, however, no small opposition was made to it. The editor of the *Southern Presbyterian* waged hot war against it as containing a mass of heresy. He threw open his columns, however, to Dr. Dabney, who ably and adequately vindidicated the article as free from heresy.

The Article in question read as follows:

"The General Assembly and the United Synod declare that they continue to sincerely receive and adopt the Con-

[1] This doctrinal statement passed easily through the Committee's hands. It teaches clearly the kind of Calvinism taught in the Westminster standards and tacitly repudiates that false Calvinism which offends by extreme statement.

fession and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures and approve of its government and discipline.

"Inasmuch as some have been supposed to hold the system of doctrine and Church order in different senses, the General Assembly and the United Synod do further adopt the following *Declaration*, touching former grounds of debate, in order to manifest our hearty agreement, to remove suspicions and offences, to restore full confidence between brethren, and to honor God's saving truth.

"1. Concerning the *Fall of Man and Original Sin*, we faithfully hold, with the Confession of Faith, that our first parents, by their first act of disobedience, 'fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties of soul and body; that they being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descended from them by ordinary generation; and that from this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.'

"This imputation of the guilt of this sin of our first parents, we hold in this sense: that thereby their posterity are judicially condemned by God on account of that sin, and so begin their existence in that corruption of nature and subjection to wrath into which our first parents fell by their first sin. And we mean that the guilt of their sin which is imputed, is, according to the constant usage of theology, 'obligation to punishment,' and not the sinfulness of the act itself, which latter cannot by imputation, be the quality of any other than the personal agents.

"Touching the moral corruption of Adam's posterity, we believe that it is entire, and also native and original; that all actual transgressions do proceed from it as their source, and not merely from imitation of evil example as the Pelagians vainly affirm, and that this native tendency to sin is itself morally evil, deserving of God's righteous wrath, and requiring, both in infants and adults, the righteousness of Christ to justify from its guilt, as well as His regenerating grace to overcome it. We do also believe that because of this original corruption men have wholly lost all ability of will to choose spiritual good for its own sake, or to regenerate, convert, or sanctify their own hearts. But we equally reject the error of those who assert that the sinner has no

power of any kind for the performance of duty. This error strips the sinner of his moral agency and accountableness, and introduces the heresy of either Antinomianism or Fatalism. The true doctrine of the Scripture as stated in our Confession, keeps constantly in view the moral agency of man, the contingency of second causes, the use of means, the voluntariness of all the creature's sins and his utter inexcusableness therein. It teaches that while the Fall has impaired and darkened all the faculties of man's soul, and inclined his free-will to evil only, it has not destroyed in him any capacity of understanding or conscience, whereby the holy creature knows and serves God, and on which free-agency and responsibility depend. And touching God's permission of the entrance of sin among His creatures, we reject the doctrine of those who assert that He had no power efficiently to prevent it in consistency with man's freedom and responsibility, and we believe that God permitted the introduction of sin for wise and good reasons which He has not revealed.

"2. Concerning *Regeneration*, we hold that this act doth essentially consist, not of a change of the creature's purpose by himself as to sin and holiness, but a change of the dispositions of souls from which such purposes do proceed, and in which change all regenerating power is of the Holy Spirit. But yet all the acts of soul, wherein the sinner turneth from his sins unto God and holiness, are by the instrumentality of God's truth, and are as rational and free as those which are performed wholly of his natural powers.

"3. Concerning the *Atonement* of Jesus Christ, we hold that He, being very God and very man in one person, was our Substitute under the Law; that the guilt of men's sins was imputed to Him, that His sufferings were borne as the penalty of that guilt, and were a vicarious yet true satisfaction therefor to the justice of God, and without this, God's perfection would forbid the pardon of any sin. This Atonement, we believe, though by temporary sufferings, was, by reason of the infinite glory of Christ's person, full and sufficient for the guilt of the whole world, and is to be freely and sincerely offered to every creature, inasmuch as it leaveth no other obstacle to the pardon of all men under the Gospel, save the enmity and unbelief of those who voluntarily reject it. Wherefore on the one hand we reject the opinion of those who teach that the atonement was so limited and equal to the guilt of the elect only, that if God had designed to redeem more, Christ must have suffered

more or differently. And on the other hand we hold that God the Father doth efficaciously apply this redemption through Christ's purchase, to all those to whom it was His eternal purpose to apply it and to no others.

"4. Concerning the believer's *Justification*, we hold that Christ not only bore the penalty of their guilt, but fully obeyed the law as their Substitute; and that the righteousness of His suffering and obedience, imputed unto them that believe, is the sole ground for which God pardoneth all their sins, and accepteth them as righteous in His sight. And we account the agency of the believer's faith in this justification to be only instrumental and not meritorious.

"5. Holding these views of the doctrine of Grace, we believe that the Church is dependent, under God, for the revival of her spiritual life, and the implanting of it in sinners, on the work of the Holy Ghost through the truth. Wherefore, we hold that the proper means for promoting revivals are the labours of holy living and teaching through the Word and Sacraments; and on the other hand we testify, from our observation, and the Word of God, that it is dangerous to ply the disordered heart of the sinner with a disproportionate address to the imagination and passions, to withhold from his awakened mind Scriptural instruction, and to employ with him such novel and startling measures as must tend to impart to his religious excitement a character rather noisy, shallow, and transient, than deep, solid, and Scriptural. But on the other hand, we value, cherish, and pray for true revivals of religion; and wherever they bring forth the permanent fruits of holiness in men's hearts, rejoice in them as God's work, notwithstanding the mixture of human imperfections. And we consider it the solemn duty of ministers to exercise a Scriptural warmth, affection, and directness in appealing to the understandings, hearts, and consciences of men.

"6. We hold that God has organized His *Church Visible*, to be 'the pillar and ground of truth,' 'for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life to the end of the world'; that hence it is the duty of every member and officer of the Church to further this work by his personal labors in his appropriate sphere, and by stated oblations of his worldly goods unto God; and that their common and concerted efforts for this end (which is the proper end of the Church in this world) are by God committed to the Presbyters and Deacons thereof, whom He has appointed as her officers. Whence it follows that the associated and organized acts of

the people of God for the conversion of the world unto Christ, are the proper functions of these officers, or of Church-courts constituted of them. Those who seek the world's conversion by societies of voluntary and human origin, distinct from the branches of Christ's visible Church, therefore ought not to ask the officers and courts of the Church to relinquish these labours to them. We bid them God-speed in all their sincere efforts to diffuse the true word of God, and we concede to the members of our churches full liberty to extend to them such personal aid as their Christian consciences approve." [1]

In connection with the report of the committee the Rev. E. T. Baird, who was not able to attend the meeting in Lynchburg, and who did not see his way clear to signing the report, addressed a communication to the General Assembly. In this letter he says that "he believes that in probably three different places the language is liable to misapprehension, and might become the cause of trouble among ourselves hereafter; and that he does not believe that any series of doctrinal articles could be framed which would not be obnoxious to the same objection;—that moreover he felt that the Assembly had no right to make anything the basis of union but the Constitution itself." [2]

The discussion in the General Assembly over the proposed terms of union deserves to rank with the foremost debates in the history of our Church. Dr. Adger led the opposition. He had for his second the distinguished and eloquent Dr. B. M. Palmer. They were opposed by Dr. Dabney supported by Drs. Hoge and Kirkpatrick, *et al.* Dabney spoke for three hours and won for himself a name far above his previous reputation. The two hours which he spent in the defence of the doctrinal statement drew forth for him the most enthusiastic admiration of the body.

After this discussion, however, the Assembly decided to omit the doctrinal propositions on the following grounds, viz.: That believing the approval of these propositions by the Committees of Conference and extensively among both

[1] *Distinctive Principles*, p. 37, *ff*.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

bodies, has served a valuable purpose, by presenting satisfactory evidence of such harmony and soundness of doctrinal views as may ground an honorable union, the Assembly does yet judge that it is most prudent to unite on the basis of our existing standards only, inasmuch as no actual necessity for other declarations of belief in order to a happy union now exists.[1]

The second part of the plan for union was modified, "so as in every case to require the reception of the Presbyteries under the care of the United Synod into the Synods of this Assembly, so as to preserve the undoubted succession of the latter."[2] After further but unessential modifications the terms of union proposed by the Committee were adopted by the Assembly, the vote being 53 for and 7 against, including Drs. Adger and Palmer, against their adoption.

The United Synod was to have met at New Dublin Church, Pulaski, Va., May, 1864. But owing to a Federal raid in that region at the time it could not convene. Thereupon the Stated Clerk called for a meeting of the Synod to be held in Lynchburg, Va., on the last Thursday of August, 1864. The Conference Committee submitted at that meeting the plan of union drawn up by the Committee in joint session recently in the same city. The plan of union as amended and adopted by the General Assembly in May, 1864, was unanimously adopted August 26, 1864. Thereafter the Synod ceased to act independently—ceased to exist as a separate body.

The reunions that followed of Presbytery with Presbytery, and Synod with Synod, were among the most cheering events in the, to the South, dreary year of 1864. At the reunion of the two Synods of Virginia in October, 1864, one of the speakers said: "When we look at the circumstances of the country, as the tide of war rushes by, as all without us is turmoil—here all is peace. I doubt if there is anywhere in the Confederacy as much peace. Blessed be God for it."[3]

[1] *Minutes of General Assembly (S. O. S.)*, 1864, p. 273.

[2] *Distinctive Principles*, p. 46; *Minutes of General Assembly*, 1864, p. 271.

[3] Colonel J. T. L. Preston, *Central Presbyterian*, November 10, 1864.

CHAPTER VII.

NO TRACE OF A NEW SCHOOL PARTY IN THE REUNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH SOUTH.

PRIOR to the meeting of the General Assembly in 1864, Synods and Presbyteries in both the Churches had adopted the proposed plan of union sent forth by the Committees of Conference. The great mass of the Synod of the South had thus previously expressed its adoption of the proposed plan including the doctrinal article.

It was safely predicted that a body which had intelligently embraced that article would prove to be Calvinistic by the test of subsequent history. Sagacious Old School men comforted themselves, too, with the thought that all the theological institutions would be in the hands of Old School men. Dr. Boyd was to have been a professor in the Seminary which the New School men had been on the point of founding near the University of Virginia. With such a man in a theological seminary trouble to the Church would have been inevitable. But upon union all thought of a separate theological school in Virginia was abandoned. Sagacious Old School men generally saw that all students for the ministry would pass through Old School Seminaries; and hence foretold that upon the passing away of the advocates of the New School doctrines their places would be supplied by men sound in the faith.

The subsequent history of the United Church shows that these predictions were well grounded. Since their reception into the Old School Church the New School men have never manifested a tendency to draw together and keep together. It is impossible for a man of the present generation to distinguish between New School men and Old School men

among his elder brethren, save by the aid of history. And when the investigator has discovered a New School man and mentions the fact to him, his first remark is apt to be: "Yes; but I never had any sympathy with the New School Theology and Polity. My being a New School man is explained on other grounds."

So far as can be seen nothing but good has come of the union of the New and Old School, South. It was a union safe to the Old School and highly honorable to both parties. It has been the occasion of great and multiform blessings to Presbyterianism in the South.

THE TEACHINGS OF ANTONIO ROSMINI AND THE CENSURES PASSED UPON THEM BY ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY.

THE TEACHINGS OF ANTONIO ROSMINI AND THE CENSURES PASSED UPON THEM BY ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY.

By HENRY CLAY SHELDON, D.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

ANTONIO ROSMINI SERBATI, who was born at Rovereto in the Italian Tyrol, in 1797, was well equipped in spirit to make a good use of the advantages which fell to him as the son of a noble family and heir to a large estate. From the period of youth the zeal and devotion of his serious nature were given to religion and philosophy. Among the standing memorials of his service to the former is the Institute of the Brethren of Charity. His ambition to promote the latter is attested by a group of writings which vies in bulk with the contributions of the most prolific of modern philosophers.

Among the causes which solicit to an appreciative consideration of the philosophical teachings of Rosmini is the decided impression of profundity and value which they have made upon various minds. Even the Jesuits, though the mainspring of attack and censure, have furnished encomiums. So distinguished a representative of the order as Perrone, writing a few years after the death of the philosopher, remarked respecting his most important treatise: "His work is worthy of being attentively studied and pondered, because it is the fruit of profound and noble studies. He shows himself possessed of a subtle acquaintance with all the recent philosophical systems of Scotland, France, and Germany, and combats with great effectiveness all manner of sensists, sceptics, idealists, and critical transcendentalists." [1]

[1] Quoted by Sichirollo.

Highly appreciative words from the contemporary Jesuit, Father Suryn, are also recorded.[1]

More recently Professor Sichirollo, in a volume devoted to hostile criticism of Rosmini's system, confesses that he may be rated as a man of "prodigious talent," and agrees with Perrone in naming him "a philosopher who greatly honors religion and Italy."[2] Segnini, describing quite as much the man as the philosopher, employs these emphatic terms: "Such intellectual and moral grandeur, combined with such humility, modesty, and simplicity, made him in all respects the most extraordinary man I have ever known, leading, as he did, a life that seemed quite ordinary."[3] Among English and non-Catholic writers Thomas Davidson has been especially earnest and outspoken in commending Rosmini's philosophy. He regards it as the most complete and tenable system that has yet been devised, a system which gathers up and unifies all important elements of philosophic truth which have been grasped by eminent thinkers from Parmenides to Hegel.[4]

A fact which unites with the foregoing in inviting a respectful attention to the writings of Rosmini is the broad and sane maxim which he adopted respecting the proper spirit and method of philosophy. The student of fundamental truth, he claimed, must avoid isolation. Disdain is incongruous with his vocation. Locke's contemptuous treatment of the doctrines of Descartes, or Descartes' indifference to his predecessors, is no true model. He who imitates it limits his possession of truth, and incurs the liability of much waste of time in making readjustments to points of view that ought to have been distinctly noticed at the start. "The true philosophical spirit can never be exclusive and individual. It is conservative, impartial, and large-hearted. It receives with respect the traditions of mankind, as well as

[1] *Life of Rosmini*, edited by Lockhart, i., 238.

[2] *La Mia Conversione dal Rosmini a S. Tommaso*, Padova, 1887, pp. 23, 371, 373.

[3] *Life* by Lockhart, ii., 58.

[4] *The Philosophical System of Antonio Rosmini-Serbati, with Introduction and Annotations*, London, 1882.

of particular sages. In a word, it is not the vain spirit of the world, but rather the spirit of Christianity itself, applied to the study and meditation of natural truths." [1]

Once more, the extent to which Rosmini exemplified his maxim, through a patient and extensive canvassing of all the more notable philosophies, favors the conviction that his own system may be worth examining. An exhaustive study of every part of so immense a domain cannot of course be claimed; but no impartial reader of Rosmini, we think, can fail to be struck with the amount of intelligent familiarity which he exhibits with different philosophical systems from the most remote to those bordering closely upon the time of writing.

As a fitting preliminary to a consideration of his own special teachings we may note briefly the attitude of Rosmini toward some of the leaders of philosophical thought. He paid tribute both to Plato and Aristotle. If he gave the larger attention to the latter it was not because a pre-eminence was assigned to him in his formal estimate; for we find him saying: "If Aristotle is marvellous for the subtlety of his mind, he lacks nevertheless the sublimity characteristic of the genius of Plato." [2] He credited Plato with a profound insight into the main conditions of the problem of knowledge, and maintained that his doctrine of ideas, duly limited, enters as a necessary factor into the solution of that problem. He accordingly rendered only a partial approval to Aristotle's criticism of the Platonic doctrine, and charged him on his side with an imperfect theory of cognition, as failing to give a tenable and intelligible account of how the mind gets the prime condition of knowledge, the possession of universals. As regards mediæval philosophy, if he did not venerate it as an ultimate standard, he still considered it to represent an important stage in the development of thought. "The schoolmen," he says, "are the link connecting the old with the modern philoso-

[1] *Origin of Ideas*, i., n. 220. The full title of this work is *Nuovo Saggio sull' Origine delle Idee*.

[2] *Ibid.*, i., n. 274.

phies, and deserve to be carefully studied. For though the scholastic philosophy in its later period became degraded, childish, and ridiculous, it was not so in its great writers, among whom it suffices to mention the prince of Italian philosophers, St. Thomas of Aquin!"[1] In interpreting Thomas Aquinas Rosmini probably was influenced to some extent by his lofty rank in ecclesiastical estimates, and made somewhat less of the discrepancy between the Aristotelian ingredients in the thinking of the great schoolman and his own system than he would have done in dealing with the same opinions in an advocate differently circumstanced. Among modern philosophers, Locke was regarded by Rosmini as making much too easy work of basal problems. He slurred over mental demands, when, instead of explaining the idea of substance, he denied its existence. His attempt to deduce general ideas from the particulars of sensations must be regarded as a decided failure. Toward Reid the attitude of the Italian philosopher was distinctly more kindly. He appreciated his undoubting faith in the objective validity of perception, and considered that he was on the road to a true theory of knowledge, but unhappily did not press on to the goal. "The real merit," he says, "of the system of Reid consists in his having fully grasped the fact that no sooner does our sense happen to be affected by the action of external agents than we necessarily affirm their existence by 'a simple act,' though he is wrong when he adds, 'by an act which cannot be defined.'"[2] Leibnitz also was evidently regarded by Rosmini with no little favor. He spoke of him as a man of "lofty intellect," and even coupled him with Plato under the category of "rare intelligences."[3] While he regarded him as failing, much like Aristotle, to see what is needed by the mind in order that it may make a beginning of knowledge, he credited him with very fruitful ideas. He appreciated especially the Leibnitzian doctrine of small perceptions, or perceptions without

[1] *Life* by Lockhart, ii., 273.
[2] *Origin of Ideas*, i., n. 130.
[3] *Ibid.*, 288; *Psychology*, ii., n. 1759.

advertence. He was apparently also very well content, if not with the proper doctrine of monads, with so much of the doctrine of the illustrious German as supposes a basis of life diffused through all nature. In relation to Kant, Rosmini's appreciation was much qualified by his very decided antipathy to the Kantian subjectivism. To deny for objective reality proper speculative warrant, or demostrative evidence, seemed to him intolerable. Nevertheless, he was not unmindful of the fact that the Sage of Königsberg had placed philosophical thinking under very considerable obligations. He regarded it as his special merit "that he grasped better than any other modern philosopher the essential difference between the two operations of our soul—feeling and knowing."[1] He also reckoned as an important truth the Kantian affirmation that all the operations of our understanding finally resolve themselves into judgments; and while he criticised Kant for predicating so many original mental forms, he rated him as standing in a select circle as respects legitimate stress upon the truth that the formal element of knowledge is innate.[2] Against Hegel Rosmini charged the capital fault of arbitrarily confusing the bounds of logic and ontology.[3] His assumption of a faculty of self-motion in ideas he characterized as altogether gratuitous and false. Referring to the first step in the Hegelian evolution he wrote: "The pretended dialectical transition from indeterminate being to becoming does not exist. In indeterminate being there is to be found nothing that can become or cause to become, no activity of any kind, but only pure *intelligibility*. Hence even the possibility of a transition is wanting."[4] The merit of Hegel, he conceived, lies in showing the inter-connection of thought, or how the mind is spurred on through the contra-position of notions by the demand which it feels of avoiding contradictions.[5] Significant references to other philosophers might be noted.

[1] *Origin of Ideas*, i., n. 340.
[2] *Ibid.*, i., n. 366.
[3] *Teosofia*, i., n. 646, 647.
[4] Davidson, *Résumé of Rosmini's System*, p. 152.
[5] *Teosofia*, ii., n. 752.

Hardly a name is omitted, unless it be that of Sir William Hamilton, which we should expect to find cited. But the references already given make a sufficient preface to Rosmini's characteristic teachings.

In construing the cognitive process, Rosmini, as appears from a comment of his already noted, was in substantial agreement with Kant in assigning to the judgment, or the act of inward affirmation, a primary place. With Kant he saw that feeling is not knowledge, but only matter of knowledge, a condition or ground of the judgment in the consummation of which the mind first issues into knowledge. He considered, therefore, that the elucidation of how the mind begins to make judgments is a fundamental item in the problem of knowledge.

To consider the possibility of judgments, Rosmini continues, is to consider the origin of ideas, of general notions or concepts. A judgment always implies a knowledge of a predicate distinct from the subject. "Now, a predicate distinct from the subject is always a universal; for so long as it is not actually united with this or that subject, it is capable of being united with many, indeed with an infinite number of possible subjects; which is primarily what we mean by the term *universal* as applied to ideas."[1]

Whence does the mind derive the general idea, or the general ideas, that cannot be dispensed with in the judgments which initiate knowledge? They cannot be given by any impact of external things. External things effect only feelings, or modifications of the subject; but ideas are never modifications of the subject; they are rather objects of the mind.[2] How does the mind come to be confronted with this kind of objects? It has been answered sometimes, in effect, that the mind has the faculty of forming on occasion these universals. But the assumption of a faculty is not a satisfactory explanation, and leaves the further question, "If that faculty does not perhaps consist simply in the power of making use of some notion or idea which man has

[1] *Origin of Ideas*, i., n. 42.

[2] *Teosofia*, ii., n. 825.

in himself *ab initio;* if, in short, it is possible for any human thought to be anything else than either the vision or the application of a rule or idea."[1] The truth is, "the faculty of forming ideas is such that it must have from its very beginning some idea which enables it to form judgments, and, through judgments, all other ideas."[2]

The supposition that the mind gets hold of general ideas by abstracting the common qualities of things has sometimes been offered as an explanation of their origin. But the explanation will not serve when a theory of knowledge is in question. If the mind abstracts the common from a plurality of objects, it is because it has first put it into the group. "The common has no existence outside the understanding. It is an element of our ideas, not a real element of external things. The existence of these things is purely individual and proper, and so are all their other qualities; for the word *common* implies a relation seen by the understanding between several objects, and a relation is not even a species of quality, so that it may exist in a real thing. It belongs to the order, not of things, but of thought."[3] If in place of external things or feelings having an external term, we put the more interior class of feelings, we come to the same result. All of these, even the feeling of personal existence included, are particular, and therefore cannot be conceived as affording any ground for a general idea.[4]

We are thus brought to this result: The simplest operation which we can predicate of the mind implies the existence of some general idea. Instead, therefore, of ascribing general ideas indiscriminately to the mind's intelligence, we must rather conclude that at least some general idea is so entirely indispensable that it may be described as constitutive of intelligence, an idea *given* to the mind as opposed to being formed thereby. Such an idea is that of *being* perfectly simple and indeterminate, the *sine qua non* of all first

[1] *Origin of Ideas*, i., n. 235.
[2] *Ibid.*, 282.
[3] *Ibid.*, 59, 60.
[4] *Ibid.*, 59; ii., n. 438.

judgments, an idea which the perceiving subject could never produce from itself, for it has nothing which bears the least resemblance thereto. The subject is particular, contingent, subsistent, whereas the idea is universal, necessary, possible. As not being produced by the mind this idea is not dependent, like other ideas, upon an antecedent judgment, and therefore cannot be charged with needing another idea to account for itself. "A judgment is necessary for ideas of *our own formation, i. e.* those which unite in themselves a predicate and a subject, and are therefore composed of two elements, one of which must be a universal, as, for instance, the ideas of bodies. But if there be an idea which does not consist of these two elements and is one of them only, there is no need of a judgment in order that we may have and conceive it. . . . Now, by examining all the ideas possessed by the human mind, we discover that there is one, and one only (the idea of existence or being in general), which has this singular property, that it is perfectly simple, and not composed of a predicate and a subject."[1] This idea variously styled that of pure being, indeterminate being, or being in general, may be characterized as the form of human intelligence, not as being a modification of the mind, but as necessary to bring the mind into act, something without which the least affirmation cannot be made.

Ideal or indeterminate being is the only universal that needs to be regarded as original or given to the mind. All other universals are but determinations of this, which are effected on occasion of the various sensations or feelings that are experienced. As capable of taking any conceivable determination ideal being corresponds to the Kantian category of possibility. The other categories in the Kantian list are therefore to be set aside as not being included in the primary mental forms. All mental forms which are not merely descriptive of ideal being, are to be regarded as derived from it, applications of it in one direction or another.[2] Thus the principle of contradiction imports that being cannot be

[1] *Origin of Ideas*, ii., n. 541.
[2] *Ibid.*, 561–624.

thought simultaneously with non-being. The apprehended necessity of a being antecedent to accident gives us the idea of substance; and the apprehended necessity of a being antecedent to the being which has a commencement gives us the idea of cause. Each of these principles or categories of thought involves a process, however simple it may be, of judgment, and therefore is not strictly original.

The points of view which have been established furnish means of escape from the bonds of subjectivity which were forged by the Kantian doctrine that the mental forms are simply immanent characteristics of the mind or laws of its operations. We have a bridge of communication with external reality. It exists in us by nature, because by nature we perceive being in itself, and this must be recognized as essentially objective, the standing object over against the human spirit, which is distinguished from it as the subject.[1] In the ego, which is a simple principle, at once intelligent and sensitive, the intuition of being and the action or feeling of it, that is the formal and material elements of cognition, are brought together. It is through this conjunction that feeling passes into knowledge, and the transition, as has been observed, is consummated by a judgment. The judgment is that this or that thing exists; in other words, has objective reality. Now such a judgment, being a necessary inference, must be valid, for it is implicated with or based upon the intuition of being which is unquestionably true and necessary.[2]

What has been said sufficiently indicates the relation of ideal being to the human spirit. It is given; it is a primitive light in man; it is necessary to bring his intelligence into act; it is the distinctive object of the understanding, as the felt is the term of the sensibility. While distinct from thinking subjects it subsists wholly in relation to them, and without such subjects it would not be.

Whence comes this mental furnishing, this ideal entity, this notion of indeterminate being, which is back of, and

[1] *Origin of Ideas*, ii., n. 1082, 1087; iii., n. 1382, 1384.

[2] Davidson, *Résumé of Rosmini's System*, pp. 114, 115; *Origin of Ideas*, iii., n. 1158.

which founds, the cognitive process? Undoubtedly its source is the Creator. It is a form of divine manifestation to the human spirit. But just what is the relation of ideal being to God? Rosmini repudiated very decidedly the notion that it is God himself manifested to the human spirit. Ideal being is perfectly indeterminate, whereas God can be seen in His reality only as He is seen in the plenitude of His determinations. But while ideal being cannot be identified with God, it may still be characterized as divine on account of its relation to God. It is an appurtenance of God. As such Rosmini seems to have conceived it as standing to the divine mind much as an abstraction does to our own. In fact he speaks of it in a few instances as a divine abstraction.[1] As related to God it is a logical entity corresponding to the infinite real entity. Owing to its intrinsic relation to the divine it does not fall properly under the category of the created ; only in an accommodated sense, that is, in so far as it is shown to us and brought under the limitations of our imperfect vision can it be called created. Its communication to us implies that an ideal entity which is contemplated by the divine mind is made in us the initial and basal idea which provides for and conditions our rational experience.[2]

A resemblance may be observed between Rosmini's view and the teaching of Malebranche respecting the vision of ideas in God. But the correspondence is only partial. It seemed to the former unwarranted to speak of seeing aught in God, since that implies a vision of God which does not belong to man in his present state. Moreover it was the conclusion of Rosmini that it is only the initial and basal idea of being that needs to be furnished outright, since this in combination with the experience which comes through contact with reality provides for all other ideas.

In a consideration of the soundness of Rosmini's ideological theory it needs to be premised that an adverse conclusion does not necessarily imply a denial of a high order of philo-

[1] *Teosofia*, i., n. 490; iii., n. 1185.

[2] See Billia, *Quaranta Proposizioni attribuite ad Antonio Rosmini, passim.*

sophical acumen in its author. The subject is one which has always taxed the human mind to the utmost; and it might very well be that in some of the distinctive features of his theory Rosmini should be at fault, and nevertheless in the total range of his discussions give ample tokens of a large and subtle power of thought.

The limits and the expository aim of this paper exclude detailed criticism. We will therefore content ourselves with the confession that the theory of Rosmini taxes somewhat severely our philosophical faith. We find it difficult to believe that so much can come out of anything so tenuous and empty as ideal being. It seems to us that the bare idea of being does not make together with sensation a sufficient mental outfit, that in fact unless the mind were possessed of an immanent constitution equivalent at least in part to that summarized in the Kantian categories, it would be inadequately equipped for the processes which under normal conditions it universally fulfils. Again, our mental attitude is somewhat rebellious toward the supposition of an idea in relation to which the mind is purely receptive, which becomes its property without any agency or co-agency on its part. The mind certainly is not like a spare room ready for and passively admitting an occupant. It is rather a pneumatic power which reaches results through self-exercise. If one object, with Rosmini, that to suppose the mind to act without an idea is to suppose an enigma, we should be inclined to respond that quite as much of an enigma is supposed when the mind is figured as having an idea except in and through an activity. An idea is not a name for a detached and floating entity, but for a specific form of mental function. It is a mental activity of a certain kind, as volition is a mental activity of another kind. It is not an outside object, not something simply given, but production or construction in the light of consciousness. This, it strikes us, is its proper description, and when an idea is differently considered it is by virtue of a process of abstraction which dislocates it from the place or character that belongs to it intrinsically. Once more, we do not share the full assurance

of Rosmini that his system affords direct and unequivocal speculative warrant for objectivity. He seems to have conceived that it furnished him with a warrant of this kind so decisive in itself as to be independent of an appeal to the trustworthiness of man's cognitive faculties.[1] In our view the warrant for objectivity is primarily practical. It lies in the imperative and race-wide demands of man's intellectual and ethical life. To deny it is stifling, suicidal, practically impossible. Speculation approves objectivity, not because it has a direct and formal proof that is above challenge, but because it is rationally forbidden to run its head against such an order of practical demands.

While the ideology of Rosmini naturally commands the larger part of the attention which is given to his system, it is to be noticed that he wrote elaborately on the general theme of psychology, and also touched not a little on the domain of theology, though failing here to complete the extensive work which he projected. From his psychological views we select only a few definitions and representations of main points. "Sensation," he says, "is a modification of the sentient subject." "Sense-perception is the sensation itself, and, more generally, any kind of feeling considered in so far as united with a real term."[2] "It is entirely certain that the mind, in placing objects before our thoughts, does not present them as they are outside of the mind, but partly as it has made them by the subjective laws of its own being and operations."[3] "Idea is being, indeterminate or determinate, considered in its possibility, or as an object of mental intuition."[4] "An idea is essentially a universal, although it may manifest the being to which it refers with all its conditions and qualities, even such as are accidental; it cannot be called *particular*, except in so far as it is considered in the perception and bound up with it."[5] "When the ob-

[1] *Teosofia*, i., n. 26.
[2] *Origin of Ideas*, ii., n. 417.
[3] *Psychology*, i., n. 58.
[4] *Origin of Ideas*, ii., n. 417.
[5] *Psychology*, ii., n. 1377.

ject of thought is ourselves, or what is or happens in us, then we know ourselves or what happens in us. Such knowledge is consciousness. Consciousness is different from feeling because consciousness is cognition and has the duality proper to cognition."[1] "The human soul is an intellective and sensitive subject or principle, having by nature the intuition of being and a feeling whose term is extended, besides certain activities consequent upon intelligence and sensitivity."[2] "There is in the soul an intellective perception of its own body, primordial and immanent, and in this perception lies the nexus between the human soul and body."[3] "The soul affirms itself, and in so doing changes itself into an ego, the ego being the soul as affirmed by itself."[4]

Occasion will be given to refer to some of the theological views of Rosmini when we come to treat of the censures passed upon his teaching. We notice here simply that he coincides with the Scholastics in extreme emphasis upon the simplicity of the divine nature; that he agrees with them in the formal conceptions by which he represents the trinitarian distinctions in the Godhead; and that he likewise follows the scholastic model in placing a preponderant stress upon the divine intelligence as compared with the divine will and affection.

The practical views of Rosmini on church affairs may be described as containing liberal elements combined with an essentially ultramontane view of papal prerogatives. The principal compendium of these views is the treatise on "The Five Wounds of the Church." This was completed in 1833, but was not published until 1846, when the disclosure of liberal tendencies by the newly elected pope, Pius IX., seemed to offer it a favorable field. Among the things contended for therein is a higher rating of the general body of the Christian people. "To be a Christian," says Rosmini, "is to be in the first [that is, initial] grade of the priest-

[1] *Psychology*, ii., n. 1479.
[2] Davidson, *Résumé of Rosmini's System*, p. 262.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 304.
[4] *Psychology*, i., n. 75.

hood."[1] He does not claim for laymen a constitutional right in ecclesiastical management; but he does advocate strenuously that they should be brought into a more sympathetic and intelligent relation both with the worship and the government of the Church. To leave the people, he argues, inadequately instructed respecting the meaning of sacred rites, at the same time that they are barred out from an understanding of the public service by the use of an unknown tongue, is to rob them of the bread of truth and to interpose an unnatural chasm between them and the clergy. Return to the example of the early Church is loudly called for at this point. Primitive practice ought also to be imitated in the matter of determining the choice of pastors. While it may not be advisable to grant an electoral function proper to the people, it is the dictate of charity and prudence to take large actual account of their preferences and to concede to these some means of formal recognition. With a higher rating of the Christian people, as Rosmini contends, a more thorough and normal education of the clergy must be conjoined. While he charges the old Scholasticism with a failure to minister properly to the element of feeling in its pupils, he places its profundity in contrast with modern haste and superficiality. Its serious effort to construe the deep truths of the Christian system needs to be conjoined with that warm, practical, and absorbing study of the great book of the human race which will prepare those who are called to fulfil the part of religious teachers not merely for scholarly isolation but for effectual contact with their fellows. Passing up to the bishops, Rosmini points out the disastrous influences which have flowed from a relative secularization of the episcopate—an evil transformation which was begun early in the Middle Ages and even yet has not been fully remedied. Catholic feeling, he says, was curtailed, sense of relationship to the Church universal was overshadowed by local interests, and the principal import of the pastoral station was put out of sight, in a system which metamorphosed bishops into courtiers and temporal lords,

[1] *Il cristiano non è che il primo grado del sacerdozio.*

and made their official dignity a kind of appanage to the secular power. The enormous evils of this system were an ample justification of the mighty efforts of Gregory VII. and others to restore the episcopate to a normal independence. But unhappily scarcely had the popes achieved their end, in considerable part by the abolition of lay investiture, when by their own act they prepared for the reimposition of bonds. Their claim to a broad exercise of the right of *reserves*, or of patronage over ecclesiastical positions, provoked disgust and resentment, and stimulated monarchs, as the decline of the feudal system increased their strength and confidence, to assert counter claims. The issue of the controversy thus provoked was the unworthy compromise which left to the temporal rulers very generally the nomination of bishops and to the pope the prerogative of confirming their appointment. The result is that the episcopate, largely shorn of its proper independence, is brought under national limitations as opposed to the catholic character which it ought to possess. With the episcopate thus shackled the Church lacks proper freedom and unity of action. The advantages which Roman Catholic governments give in return for this system of restriction are no adequate compensation; and it is necessary to look to the United States and other non-Catholic countries to find the Church in possession of legitimate freedom and power of direct impact upon its constituency.

Something of the same order of sentiments appears in the sketch which Rosmini drew up for a constitution, entitled "The Constitution according to Social Justice." He notices here that the Church needs protection of its liberty more than the patronage of royal dynasties, makes a plea for the liberty of the press accompanied by safeguards against abuse, and suggests a possible consummation of Italian unity in the sense of a federation of the different states of the Peninsula.

No part of these treatises, it is evident, was dictated by more fervent conviction than that containing the anti-Erastian polemic which has been outlined. How was this feature

received? It was probably one of the main reasons for condemnation. This conclusion is favored by a reference to the condition of affairs at the time that notice was given that the books had been placed in the Index of Prohibited Writings (1849). Pius IX. had shortly before given up his abortive liberal scheme, and was now in close fellowship with the party of reaction. By the influence of this party Rosmini had been driven from the counsels of the pope. The same motive which led to an antagonizing of his personal influence was naturally operative for the censuring of the writings in question, since both the one and the other stood more or less in the way of the alliances that were coveted by the reactionary party with the leading secular powers. Indeed, Rosmini has made known to us that this was declared—if not by the Congregation of the Index, by some one whom he regarded as properly informed—to have been the motive of the censure. "It comforts me," he wrote, "to have been assured that the prohibition was not made on account of any propositions worthy of theological censure being found in the works, but because they were thought inopportune in the political state of the times and, above all, displeasing to some of the sovereign powers, on account of what is said on the subject of the election of bishops."[1] If this be the proper version of the matter, the friends of the memory of Rosmini can urge that it is not inopportune to remove the censure, now that opinions closely approximating to his anti-Erastian sentiments are proclaimed in the open under probable encouragement from headquarters.[2]

Meanwhile a movement had been initiated for a censure of a more inclusive character—for nothing less, in fact, than a decisive condemnation of Rosmini's system of philosophy. This was mainly urged on by the Jesuits, though, as has been noticed, the order was not unanimous in its denunciation of the teachings of Rosmini. After the first published attack in 1841 the assault was kept up with little intermis-

[1] *Life* by Lockhart, ii., 15.

[2] See the volume entitled *Le Vatican, les Papes, et la Civilisation*, Paris, 1895.

sion. By 1851 the multiplied accusations led to an examination. The result, as reached in 1854 (the year preceding the death of Rosmini), was the sentence *Dimittantur Opera*, the ordinary formula for dismissing charges. This was a rather emphatic admonition to silence on the part of the accusers. But their zeal for orthodoxy was not to be set at naught in this way. The gentlemen of the Civiltà Cattolica and their allies took the liberty to treat the sentence of 1854 as merely provisional, and indeed to declare that such was its character. This allegation was openly and officially denied by the Prefect of the Congregation of the Index in 1876.[1] But superior to all discouragement, and realizing their high vocation to direct the constituted tribunals of the Church out of the paths of error, the Jesuits still pressed toward the goal of their aspiration, a safeguarding of orthodoxy by a damnatory sentence. The reward of a half-century of industrious effort was at hand. What they could not accomplish under the reactionary rule of Pius IX., they were able to effect under the so-called liberal rule of Leo XIII. Near the end of 1887 the Holy Office issued a decree, confirmed by the Pope, condemning forty propositions from the writings of Rosmini, and instructing the bishops throughout the Roman Catholic world to keep their flocks from being infected with the erroneous teachings. Since the date of this decree, two publications in Italy, whose titles indicate that they were in the interest of the Rosminian philosophy, have been placed in the Index of Prohibited Writings.[2]

The Jovian method of the Roman tribunals, or their custom to attach no reasons or explanations to their condemnatory sentences, sometimes embarrasses the interpretation of their acts. This is the case with the sentence against some of the forty Rosminian propositions. About half of these relate to the ideology of Rosmini, especially to its

[1] *Life* by Lockart, ii., 325.

[2] *Il Nuovo Rosmini*, Periodico Scientifico-Letterario, Milano, Decr. 26 Feb., 1890. *Il Rosmini*, Enciclopedia di Scienze e Lettere, redata da un Consiglio di Direzione composto di Scrittori accreditate nei diversi Rami del Sapere, Milano, Decr. 29 May, 1889.

distinctive teaching on ideal being. Now, the question inevitably arises as to the dogma with which this teaching conflicts. Surely the Holy Office would not regard it as its function to reprobate philosophical teachings which have no perceptible bearing upon dogma. We can but think that it would hesitate to claim an autocracy in the purely philosophical domain. It is therefore perfectly appropriate to inquire against what dogma the teaching on ideal being is supposed to impinge, or what theological heresy is implicit therein. We believe that little or nothing is hazarded in assuming that the intent of the censure was to exhibit this teaching as harboring the bane of pantheism. The charge of pantheism has in various instances been thrown out against Rosmini. The Civiltà Cattolica, besides stigmatizing him as a liberal and a Jansenist, has named him a pantheist. These facts unite with the verbal characteristics of some of the sentences selected for condemnation in warranting the conclusion that pantheistic error was meant to be rebuked by the judgment of the Holy Office. Doubtless taken in isolated fashion and judged by their sound, one and another of the censured propositions may seem to affiliate with pantheism. But, as Leo XIII. had occasion to remark in a certain connection, that is no proper way to judge of the meaning of propositions. They are to be placed in their proper setting. And happily this can be done in the present instance to good advantage, without the necessity of perusing the voluminous works of Rosmini. Professor Billia has accompanied the forty condemned propositions with their proper context and with statements intrinsically related to their subject-matter.[1] Any one who will examine the ample volume thus compiled will discover, we believe, these two things: first, that Rosmini meant to repudiate pantheism, and, secondly, that he was at much pains to guard his teaching from pantheistic implications. We believe also that he will discover that it is only a forced construction which can find pantheism in the doctrine of ideal being. For our part we cannot see how the notion that

[1] *Quaranta Proposizioni attribuite ad Antonio Rosmini.*

something pertaining to God becomes to man a principle of intellectual illumination, or gives his mind the needed initial means of action, involves pantheism. In such a notion there is no approach to a proper substantial identification of God and the creature. Professor Sichirollo argues, it is true, that there is a pantheistic vein in the Rosminian tenet. But his argument is the reverse of convincing. He says Rosmini teaches that we have an intuition of ideal being; that he grants the propriety of applying the epithet *divine* to ideal being; that the divine must be identical with God; that accordingly it follows logically from his premises that we have here an intuition of God.[1] Now, Rosmini emphatically denies this conclusion; but suppose it to be granted, do we get pantheism? Why does the intuition of God in this life involve pantheism any more than does the intuition of God in the life to come which is declared to be a well-approved Catholic truth?[2] Or is it the Professor's meaning that because the ideal being which is intuited is indeterminate, therefore there is danger on the basis of Rosmini's teaching of reducing God to the indeterminate being of pantheism? How far short does this fall of being a ridiculous apprehension? The intuition is of indeterminate being; therefore forsooth Rosmini comes near to reducing God to the indeterminate being of pantheism, though it is a cardinal doctrine of his system that the intuition in question does not ascend to God in His proper character or present Him in His reality. The most of a criticism which the facts presented would justify is, that Rosmini was not altogether clear and satisfactory in construing the relation of ideal being to God, not that He denied to God His true character or laid any real basis for such a denial. We conclude, then, that in condemning this line of propositions, and declaring them condemned in the sense of their author, the Holy Office and the pontiff do not escape the appearance of having fulfilled the behests of an aggressive faction, at the

[1] *La Mia Conversione dal Rosmini a S. Tommaso.*

[2] *Nessun cattolico nega che noi in cielo abbiamo l'intuizione immediata di Dio*, p. 84.

expense of dealing unjustly with the honor of a great and devoted son of the Church.

The remaining propositions touch upon a variety of theological points. As it would consume too much space to notice them in detail we select a few of the more peculiar and significant. Proposition thirty-four, taking for granted the immaculate conception of the Virgin, teaches that a sufficient account of it would be given if it were supposed that a small portion of human seed had been preserved incorrupt and continuously transmitted until at the opportune moment it was utilized in the conception of the Virgin. An eccentric view perhaps, but why mention it for condemnation in a document, the epistolary accompaniment of which directs to the study of Thomas Aquinas as the master of orthodoxy? Was it a grave dogmatic fault of Rosmini to speculate merely on the *mode* of the immaculate conception, and nothing contrary to the fame of Aquinas for orthodoxy to have denied out and out, as he did, the *immaculate conception itself?*[1] Who can fail to marvel at the extraordinary consistency of inserting this item right in sight of a virtual appeal from the heterodoxy of Rosmini to the orthodoxy of Aquinas?

Propositions twenty-nine, thirty, and thirty-one give a special turn to the dogma of transubstantiation. There is no denial of the fact of the conversion of the substance of bread and wine. The innovating opinion is that they are not changed into the whole body of Christ, but rather into a kind of heavenly nutriment which becomes part and parcel of the glorified body of Christ in a way analogous to the incorporation of food with our bodies. We do not find that Rosmini has given an explicit statement of his motive for this interpretation. But it is probable that he found himself incompetent to conceive the possibility of the change of one substance into an already existing substance. Thomas Aquinas seems to have regarded himself as equal to this feat, for he expressly excluded the supposition of the annihilation

[1] Beata Virgo contraxit quidem originale peccatum, sed ab eo fuit mundata, antequam ex utero nasceretur, *Sum. Theol.*, iii., 27, 2.

of the substance of the eucharistic bread and its replacement by the substance of Christ's body[1]; and the language in which the Trent fathers formulated the dogma of transubstantiation indicates that they followed Aquinas in supposing a veritable conversion of one substance into an already existing substance. So Rosmini stands convicted here of being aside from the traditional teaching. Still, it strikes us that his fault was not of the aggravated sort. It is hard for the mind to conceive that $1 + 1 = 1$. Not a whit less difficult is it to conceive that one substance can be converted into another already existing substance; that is, one be constituted out of two, without the annihilation or increase of either of the two. Rosmini could affirm in behalf of his view that the letter of the creed does not assert conversion into the *entire* substance of Christ's body, and therefore it is not strictly forbidden to assume that the substance of the bread is converted into His body in the sense that it becomes an increment of His body. Who knows but that in providing this outlet to the human intellect he was rendering quite as good service to Roman dogma as were the Holy Office and the pontiff in closing up the outlet?

It may be noticed in passing that Rosmini, in defining an accident as that which cannot be conceived to have real existence apart from a substance,[2] was somewhat unmindful of the sacrifice which philosophy is called upon to make to dogma. Thomas Aquinas consulted better for dogma when he described an accident, not as that which necessarily inheres in a substance, but rather as that which has an aptitude so to inhere[3]; that is, we presume, it is to be regarded as glued in quite firmly, but nevertheless capable of being pulled out by a sufficient power. A strict antithesis, however, is not to be affirmed between Rosmini and Aquinas on this point. In spite of his definition, the former, when treating directly of the subject of the eucharist, seems to accord a place to the notion of disengaged accidents.[4] He

[1] *Sum. Theol.*, iii., 75, 2–6.

[2] *Psychology*, n, 52, 856, 1058, 1129.

[3] *Sum. Theol.*, iii., 77, 1.

[4] *Introduzione del Vangelo secondo Giovanni*, Torino, 1882, p. 278.

retained, apparently, enough of the traditional doctrine of the eucharist to get himself into a tangle, or to make his dogmatic terminology collide with the sane result of his philosophical thinking.

Proposition twenty-seven teaches that the human will in Christ, through the completeness of its adhesion to the Word, passed out of the ordinary function of a will as a principle of action, ceased to be personal as it is in other men, and became nature. Practically this teaching was closely approximated by much of the patristic and scholastic theology in the over-shadowing import and prominence which were accorded to the divine as compared with the human in Christ. But unquestionably it has a monothelite sound. In its selection the collector cannot be charged with having made an unnatural detour for the purpose of swelling his list.

Much less than this can be said for the inclusion of the last three propositions. In fact their selection suggests a numerical exigency. As one hundred and one propositions are said to have been packed into the bull Unigenitus in order to make good the allegation that the "Moral Reflections" of Quesnel contained more than a hundred errors, so it would seem that it was thought necessary to make the round number of forty counts against the teaching of Rosmini. Otherwise, why should three propositions, which, in treating of the beatific vision, speak of certain conditions and limitations, be cited for condemnation? Have the gentlemen of the Holy Office got such an infallible insight into this transcendent theme that they are qualified to judge and to censure each and every speculation thereupon that does not conform to a specific pattern? If so, they can hardly be called with propriety successors of the apostles. They belong to a superior order, and stand on a higher plane of insight than the apostles ever dreamed of having attained.

It has been noticed that in the sentence against Rosmini's teaching the occasion was utilized to commend the authority of Thomas Aquinas. This fact counts for one item in the most industrious effort ever made to secure the intellectual

headship of one man over the Roman Catholic Church. The result will be watched by those who are cognizant of the conditions with no little interest. Meanwhile, one thing is certain: it will be on account of something else than mental clearness and insight, if continuous rest is to be found in the Thomist philosophy and theology. Both the one and the other may have their eminent merits; but to be deserving of praise in many particulars and to be worthy of the stamp of finality are very different things.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

By Rev. JOSEPH HENRY ALLEN, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

In reciting the symptoms of popular discontent in Massachusetts at the time of his recall, in 1774, Governor Hutchinson uses these words: "The people had been persuaded that *their religion as well as their liberties was in danger*. It was immaterial whether they had been deceived or not: the persuasion was the same; and this was what would *cause them to go all lengths*, and to surmount the greatest difficulties." (*Hist.*, vol. iii., p. 455.)

Just how religious differences came to be complicated with the political question, we see in a passage of Samuel Adams's address to the Boston representatives written something more than six years before, in January, 1768: "The establishment of a *Protestant episcopacy in America* is also very zealously contended for; and it is very alarming to a people whose fathers, from the hardships they suffered under such an establishment, were obliged to fly their native country into a wilderness, in order peacefully to enjoy their privileges civil and religious. Their being threatened with loss of both at once must throw them into a disagreeable situation. We hope in God such an establishment will never take place in America, and we desire you would strenuously oppose it. The revenues raised in America, for aught we can tell, may be as constitutionally applied *towards the support of prelacy as of soldiers and pensioners.*" My object in this paper is to illustrate these two declarations by

a few comments suggested in the ecclesiastical annals of the time.

In fact, two rival establishments were at this time contending for supremacy in the colony. The Congregational Order had been made, under the old colonial law, a part of the political constitution, and was maintained by public law—as it continued to be, in part, down to our own day (1833). But ever since the Restoration of Charles II. it had met a series of checks and encroachments. In 1662, while England was beginning to suffer under the legal atrocities of the "Act of Uniformity" and those which followed, a royal edict compelled the equal tolerance here of Episcopalians and Quakers. This, however unwelcome, was no more than right. But it was soon followed, in England, by the rejection, under High Church influence, of the wise proposal, made by Sir Matthew Hale in 1668, of a *modus vivendi* as between the Church and Nonconformists. It was natural to dread lest the conformity, so obstinately and so cruelly forced upon English subjects at home, might be in like manner compelled upon the Colonies. The draft (which was never put in working shape) of a charter for creating a bishopric of Virginia, in 1672, ordains that "all our remaining regions and plantations in America, with their churches now and hereafter, be joined and united with the aforesaid church and diocese of Virginia."[1] For the present, New England is to be exempt from the authority of the Virginia episcopate, "until by us it shall be otherwise ordained."

This warning hint was followed, in the last year of Charles (1684), by the abolition of the Colonial Charter of Massachusetts under a decree of the Court of Chancery; and in 1686, under Sir Edmund Andros, the first Episcopal Church was founded in Boston,—the "King's Chapel," which represented officially the king's authority in Church and State. Here, in later years, the organ loft was decorated with the two symbols of crown and mitre—to be seen there now; and a State pew, exalted and draped in scarlet, made a sort of

[1] The original Latin form of this draft will be found in the *Annals of King's Chapel* (Boston), vol. ii., p. 229.

throne, where the royal governor sat on high days, in the showy insignia of his rank, a challenge and a deep offence to all republican eyes. In the Papers of this Society it has already been told[1] how, under these circumstances, Increase Mather "slipped out of New England, early in April, 1688," evading the vigilance of Andros, and for three years remained in London, where it was his work "to rescue for Massachusetts the larger part of her civil liberties, and to put her churches and her schools beyond the danger of forcible conversion to Episcopal uses by the agents of the English government."

It thus came about that, at the period with which we have to deal, there were in New England two rival claimants, each exceedingly watchful and jealous of the other, each asserting itself to be the true "established church" of the colony, one resting on the authority of the Crown and the other on that of the People. The rivalry between the two, by Hutchinson's testimony, was what gave its peculiar acrimony and obstinacy to the impending political contest. Other religious bodies—Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, or Quaker—may, if we rightly understand his language elsewhere, be counted out as neutral or else divided in that contest; while the Episcopal Church was officially and closely identified with the Loyalists, and the Congregational body, through its most influential ministers and lay leaders, made (according to Hutchinson) the head and front of the Revolutionary party, so eager and combative during the twelve years, especially, of which he speaks.

This rivalry, by the way, is wholly confined to New England, practically to Massachusetts and Connecticut. In Virginia, where Episcopacy had been established from the beginning, its natural leaders fell more easily into the movement which was headed by a great landed aristocracy: under such a chief as Washington, the political never became entangled or embittered by an ecclesiastical conflict. Besides, the Episcopal body in Virginia, though reinforced

[1] By Dr. Williston Walker, of the Hartford Theological Seminary. See *Papers* for 1893, pp. 73, 74.

in 1632 by adopting the English law of penalties against dissent, could hardly have been so strong, socially, as its numbers might seem to show; for many of that clergy, we are told, regarded that region as a sort of penal colony, from which they were chiefly anxious to escape; and the Church there had in its earlier days neither dignity nor authority. "Many came," says John Hammond in 1656, "such as wore black coats and could babble in a pulpit, roar in a tavern, exact [a maintenance] from their parishioners, and rather, by their dissoluteness, destroy than feed their flocks. Very few of good conversation would adventure thither, as thinking it a place where the fear of God was not."

Here in New England, if we try to compare the numbers of the two rival establishments, our nearest figures are these: Dr. Stiles, in 1760, reckons the number of Congregational churches in New England at five hundred and thirty; while, early in the century, the bishop of Hereford speaks of "the churches" (Episcopal) in the American colonies as "about one hundred in the whole": in New England, at this time, they were probably between thirty and fifty, most of them missionary stations, some of them bringing together a mere handful of disciples. Thirty-six is the officially reported number of such stations in 1748. The great disparity in numbers, however, was fairly balanced by social position, official influence, the support given to Episcopacy by authority in England, the discipline of a powerful and skilful organization, and the steady pressure, exerted now for near a century, to establish an American bishopric, avowedly as a means to strengthen the political tie that bound the colonies to the mother country. Not only the "Royal Chapel" in Boston was the centre of a brilliant court circle including the proudest names of the colonial aristocracy; but a surprising proportion of the leading Boston families—merchants, officials, and professional men—are recorded in its annals. Besides its aged rector, Dr. Caner, no less than twenty-seven names of its pew-owners are recorded of those who suffered exile and confiscation of goods, when the defeated and desponding troop of Loyalists sailed away in the British fleet at the raising of the siege in 1776.

Before coming to the two sharp controversies which gave fullest expression to the rival animosities of the parties to the ecclesiastical battle, it will not be out of place to recall the steps by which their rivalry had become embittered. In 1692, against the strong protest of both Catholic and Quaker, who equally enjoyed its chartered right of liberty, Episcopacy was legally established in Maryland, to be maintained at the public charge; and from the mission of the Rev. Thomas Bray, who was sent to inspect its churches in 1700, there issued a religious foundation which meets us at every step in our later following-out of the subject,—the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," chartered under William III. in 1701. The terms of its charter, as we find them stated in the war of pamphlets that ensued sixty years later, are absolutely broad and generous. They apparently intend a work interesting alike to every Christian body,—the evangelizing of a country wide, new, poor, and largely destitute of civilizing agencies; the conversion, especially, of savage tribes upon the frontier, implying defence against the most dreadful dangers; the strengthening of Christian settlements sparsely scattered, as a check to their lapsing into barbarism,—all which points were brought to the front in the debates that followed later. But, instead, these debates charged it with employing funds liberally subscribed in England for the purposes of a purely Episcopalian propaganda, with a view to introduce Episcopacy as a political establishment in America. Further, it was charged with employing more of its missionaries in New England alone than in all the Colonies south of New York put together; and these, instead of being sent to remote or destitute localities, found pleasant homes in the best settled and best taught regions of the Western continent—Boston, Cambridge, Newbury, Ipswich, Salem, Braintree, Portsmouth, and Marblehead being its most important "missionary" stations. Not only the New England congregations, which had carefully districted and tilled that soil for near a century, had to endure the affront of being spotted as missionary ground; but, with the wanton though natural exaggeration

that treats a new country as if it were all a rude frontier, they must listen to an English bishop who confounds them, vaguely, among those "colonists who with their native soil abandoned their native manners and religion"; who lived in many parts "without any divine worship, in dissolute wickedness and the most brutal profligacy of manners"; who, "instead of converting barbarian infidels, as they undertook to do, became themselves infidels and barbarians." "Nay," says Jonathan Mayhew, then in the heat of controversy, "it is credibly reported that some of the warm Episcopalians have said *they hoped for the time when they might shoot dissenters as freely as they might pigeons!*" Dr. Cutler of Christ Church, Boston, the former President of Yale, was reported to have said that "there is ordinarily no salvation out of the communion of the Episcopal Church"; and we may take it as a retort personal when Rev. Noah Hobart, addressing certain Episcopalian converts, says that "probably there are many immortal souls now in hell, who, had you contentedly remained in our communion, might have spent an happy eternity in heaven!"

Turning from these amenities of eighteenth-century debates, we resume the course of events that were bringing the ecclesiastical warfare to its crisis. The "Society" diligently followed up its propaganda in New England during the early years of the century. For some reason—the same condition of things, perhaps, that brought about the founding of "consociations," or local presbyteries—its effects seem to have been soonest manifested in Connecticut, where, in 1722, a rector and tutor of Yale College, with four of its trustees, joined the ranks of Episcopacy, three of them going to England for ordination, and becoming afterward zealous propagandists. In 1725, by what appears to have been a new as well as large construction, Massachusetts is asserted to be within the Episcopal See of the Bishop of London,—this, to carry out the theory, now more definitely maintained, that the Church of England has been the true ecclesiastical establishment in the Colonies all along; whereas "Independency," says Whitefield in a letter of 1740, "may as

well be reckoned the established worship there as Presbytery the established worship in Scotland." This was, perhaps, the most distinct threat of all to the religious liberties of the colonists; since, in theory, it added to their crime of non-conformity the guilt of open schism, and some of the Church party spoke "with much regret, and even indignation, of the act of toleration, by which that of uniformity was in part repealed." Now, under that act of uniformity, with those which followed it, it was said, "nearly eight thousand persons had perished in the prisons of King Charles." What a motive of dread was here, and what strength it gave to the appeal of those at all inclined to revolution, if ritualism should be enthroned here under law, as in Old England!

The two crises in the struggle which have been alluded to are known in the story of our churches as the "Hobart Controversy" in Connecticut (1747–51), and the "Mayhew Controversy" in Massachusetts (1763–66). A brief notice of these will complete the sketch I have in mind, and bring us to the time when the impending political conflict absorbed or else overshadowed all other differences.

The occasion of the first was this. At the ordination in Stamford, Connecticut, of Rev. Noah Welles, a sermon was preached by Rev. Noah Hobart of Fairfield—a Harvard graduate of 1724, a man of high repute for learning and general ability—on "Ministers of the Gospel considered as fellow-laborers." In form it was a defence of the Congregational order, as putting all its ministers on the same official level, favoring equal fellowship among them, with the mutual strengthening of their hands for the necessary tasks of instruction and discipline in the churches. Against this he sets the evil examples of itinerant revivalists,—stirred by the "Great Awakening" of ten or twelve years before, and by the preaching of Whitefield, so jealously regarded by the sober New England ministers,—whose volunteer superintendency in things spiritual had brought grief into so many churches. But the chief object of attack was the invasion of Episcopacy. This was censured first on the ground of Discipline;

for Prelacy, he says, gives to "a few ministers too much and many too little authority to discharge their commission from Christ." "No wonder," he adds, "if persons who by their immoral lives expose themselves to ecclesiastical censures choose the communion of that church which (at least in its present state in this country) can exercise no discipline upon them." And, secondly, "you will run the venture of contracting the awful guilt of Schism, by forsaking the communion of regularly instituted and well governed churches of Christ, in which you were baptized and educated." He concludes with a warning against "that carelessness and looseness, that open-irreligion and undisguised profaneness which" (he asserts) "are so dreadfully visible where the Church of England has the ascendant, and especially where people are so unhappy as to have no other religious profession!"

This turning of the tables against Episcopacy at its two strongest and tenderest points, apostolical succession with decency and order of discipline, carried quite a new temper into the debate. We now hear—in the "Vindication" by James Wetmore—the open assertion of royal and parliamentary supremacy in matters spiritual; the Church of England, it was claimed, "is the nation of England Christian," including New England as well as Old; the Puritan clergy are stigmatized as "renegado presbyters," who had renounced both their subjection to bishops and their ordination vows—a charge, as coming from a New-Englander, which, even if it were true, as Mr. Hobart very aptly retorts, it was not "decent for him" to make. The most significant point of his reply is the hint that Episcopacy would "bring the Plantations into an unnecessary and hurtful state of dependence." In "all their civil concerns," their dependence on Great Britain is undisputed, and is right: nobody can deny the loyalty of every "man of sense in them all." But an ecclesiastical dependence is "what neither God nor man requires of us." The war of pamphlets that followed seems to have become more bitter and personal as it went on, till its flame, as is usual in such cases, went out in smoke.

The later controversy began with the charge of misappropriation of funds made against the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," already spoken of. This, it was asserted, had been turned from the true objects of missionary work, especially the conversion of Indians, into a means for undermining, and ultimately destroying, the system of independency itself. "The business of that Society," the Archbishop of York had said, "was not so much to increase the number of Christians by conversion of the Indians, as to unite the subjects of Great Britain in one Communion."[1]

The controversy began in the following way: One of the missionaries of the Society had died in Braintree, Massachusetts, in February, 1763; and, a few days after his funeral, a newspaper article appeared ridiculing his mission there as a feeble and useless pretence. A pamphlet in defence of the Society was prepared by Rev. East Apthorp, founder of Christ Church in Cambridge, generally fair and moderate in tone, but claiming, among other things, as a fruit of the Episcopal mission, that "Religion no longer wears among us that savage and gloomy appearance with which superstition had terribly arrayed her; its speculative doctrines are free from those senseless horrors with which fanaticism had perverted them; hypocrisy has worn off in proportion as men have seen the beauty of holiness; and, above all, that exterminating monster persecution is itself exterminated from the temper and practice of the age." All this, which was probably meant for harmless pulpit rhetoric, was taken as so many specific and malignant charges against the system which Episcopacy had come to supplant. It would be tedious and vain to attempt a review of this bulky controversy, which on one part was sustained with great vigor and strong party feeling by Jonathan Mayhew as champion in every sense of colonial liberties, and on the other drew in the worldly-wise Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Secker, upon whom Mayhew retorted with scornful and bitter personality. The argument, on both

[1] Letter of Dr. Lardner to Jonathan Mayhew, July 18, 1763.

sides, is mainly the assertion of fact, often no doubt loose, distorted, or contradictory, and interesting chiefly as throwing sidelights on the temper or circumstances of the day. A sufficiently full account of it will be found in the recently published *Annals of King's Chapel* (vol. ii., pp. 241–280). I copy here a few short passages which illustrate the special topic of this paper. They are taken chiefly from the three thick pamphlets in which Mayhew follows up his attack on the alleged encroachments of Episcopacy. He, it will be remembered, was not only a bold and popular preacher, but a personal friend and partisan of the most advanced revolutionists of his day. He is described by his opponents as "a rough, ludicrous, and audacious man, equally disliked by most of the dissenters and us, and equally an enemy to the trinity, to loyalty, and to episcopacy"; yet his death, in July, 1766, when the embers of the dispute were hardly cold, brought out expressions both "affectionate and charitable," from some of the Episcopalian clergy themselves.

In a private letter he says of these clergy that they "are often seized with a sort of frenzy, which I know not how to describe, unless it be by one or two of its most remarkable symptoms. These are, preaching passive obedience, worshipping King Charles I., and cursing the dissenters and puritans for murdering him." He rejoices in giving "some broad hints that he is on the side of liberty, the Bible, and common sense, in opposition to tyranny, priestcraft and nonsense, without danger of the Bastile and the inquisition." And in his retort to certain slurs in Archbishop Secker's pamphlet, he says, referring to that prelate's political antecedents, "I had much rather be the 'poor' son of a good man, who spent a long life and his patrimony in the humble and laborious though apostolical employment of preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ to poor Indians, than even the rich son and heir of one who had, by temporizing in religion and tampering with politics, by flattering the great and prostituting his conscience, made his way to a bishopric and the worldly dignity of a peer,—how large a bag soever he had carried with him through a life of idleness and pride,

of intrigue and luxury, or left behind him at death, the black period of all his greatness and glory."

Such words as these show the temper of hostility and defiance which had now come to prevail in the religious no less than in the political atmosphere of the colonies. To continue in words cited from John Adams, referring to these events: "If any one supposes this controversy to have no influence on the great subsequent question, he is grossly ignorant. It [the Episcopal scheme] spread an universal alarm against the authority of parliament. It excited a general and just apprehension that bishops, dioceses, churches, priests, and tithes were to be imposed on us. If parliament could tax us, they could establish the Church of England here, with all its creeds, articles, tests, ceremonies, and tithes, and prohibit all other churches as conventicles and schism-shops." Thus the temper of the political struggle was embittered, and the ecclesiastical line was sharply drawn between patriot and tory, between Episcopalian loyalist and the colonial revolt.

The battle of the Churches, which has now been briefly traced, brings us to a time within nine years from the events of Lexington and Bunker Hill. In the interval, men's minds became more sharply divided by the political conflict which was fast narrowing down to the issue of armed force, and differences of ecclesiastical opinion and policy were more and more overshadowed or overlooked. The Boston loyalists, in siege as afterwards in exile, were no longer a formidable adversary to be reckoned with, and, it is likely, no longer the object of special animosity or dread. And the controversy I have described may be held to have come to an end when, on the fifth of September, 1774, Samuel Adams, the last of the Puritans, made peace with local and sectarian jealousies, by nominating an Episcopalian chaplain at the first session of the first Continental Congress.

THE AMSTERDAM CORRESPONDENCE.

THE AMSTERDAM CORRESPONDENCE.

By EDWARD T. CORWIN, D.D., Greendale, N. Y.

CONTEMPORARY DOCUMENTS.

The worth of contemporary documents for the writing of history needs no discussion. The zeal of Americans in searching out and accumulating such material has steadily increased since the opening of the present century. Historical societies have sprung up representing States or portions of States, groups of States or the nation, particular denominations or the Church at large. Such societies exist for the sake of collecting and preserving contemporary documents, or of securing specially prepared papers to elucidate particular points of history, or to stimulate to greater diligence in the historic field. Thousands of valuable documents have thus been rescued from oblivion or destruction, and many of them published, leading to new investigations, fresh expositions of history, and still further discoveries.

But, with the exception of actual writers of history, the fact remains that only a few adequately appreciate the importance of collecting, while it is possible, contemporary documents; and the devotees in this line are often obliged to labor under great discouragements while striving to awaken interest in special fields, and in securing the necessary conditions to accumulate and make available such material.

In reference to ecclesiastical history, provision is generally made by the constitutions of the several denominations for the faithful keeping of the records of both local churches and the higher ecclesiastical assemblies; and these records

with some other material, such as biographies and the records of benevolent and educational institutions, with a knowledge of doctrines, ought to make it comparatively easy to develop the histories of our several denominations as well as of our American Christianity in general. And this is indeed true, especially of periods since the Revolution. For, notwithstanding these excellent constitutional provisions for keeping records, it was not always practicable in colonial times to carry out the principle. The country was sparsely settled, the churches were often for decades destitute of pastors, and formally organized meetings with proper records could not always be secured; or if the circumstances were more favorable, the meagre records which were kept have often been lost or destroyed.

But are we, therefore, left destitute of material for the Church history of colonial days? By no means. Rich sources of information yet remain. The American Churches ever looked back with filial reverence for counsel and support to the parent Churches from which they sprung. Even down to the Revolution the colonists generally spoke of the lands from whence they came as Home. They considered themselves as abroad. And as dutiful children love to write to their parents, giving many interesting details of their life, and from which their history can be better written, subsequently, than from almost any other source; so is it with the history of our colonial Churches. The best and fullest material for their early history is not unfrequently to be found in the correspondence preserved in their ancestral Churches in Europe.

DOCUMENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Perhaps this does not apply quite so fully to New England, on account of its general Congregational polity, as to the other States. Yet it applies in some respects to New England. Take one example. Where can we find the details of the history of the New England missionaries to the Indians, Eliot, the Mayhews, and others, so fully as in the records of that English "Society for Propagating the

Gospel in New England," chartered by Cromwell in 1649, and which was presided over for thirty years and largely sustained and ultimately endowed by that princely giver, Robert Boyle?

But to come to the other States. Where can we find the early history of our Episcopal Churches and ministers so fully as in the records of that Church of England "Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts," incorporated by William the Third in 1701? From these the history of the colonial Church of England in America has been compiled again and again; by Hawkins in 1845, and still more elaborately by Anderson in 1856, and by others at earlier dates. And recently (1894), a *Classified Digest* of the records of that Society (1701–1892) has been published to make this material still more accessible. No other denomination has done as much to elucidate its early history as the Episcopal Church.[1] And this material also throws not a little light upon many of the peculiar conditions and policies of the times, as well as upon many of the clergy of other bodies, especially those of the Dutch Church, to whom incidental allusions are often made. Or where can we find some of the most important facts relating to the colonial history of the Presbyterians except in the records of the Church of Scotland and of Ireland, as well as in those of that Scottish "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge" chartered in 1709? Indeed there was a frequent, if not a steady stream of correspondence between the several classes of English ministers in America and the Church authorities in Great Britain, whether Bishops, Missionary Boards, Assemblies, Presbyteries, or Associations. And while the Church-records of English colonists have an importance of their own for their early Church history, far fuller and more important details may often be found in the correspondence with, or in the ecclesiastical Acts of their ancestral Churches

[1] The works referred to were, indeed, all published in London, but in this country have been printed not a few works of original material on Episcopal Church history, as *Facsimiles of Church Documents*, privately printed, 1874–9; and Hawks and Perry's *Documentary History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in United States*, 2 vols., New York, 1862–4.

or their Missionary Agencies.[1] Such material is also sometimes to be sought at the present day in public or private libraries, or in places of deposit, like the Somerset House in London. The importance of making all such material available, by transcription and publication, can hardly be overestimated as a preparation for the writing of the history of the Church of colonial times.[2]

DOCUMENTS IN HOLLAND.

But our topic, more specifically, is "THE AMSTERDAM CORRESPONDENCE."[3] This title relates to the letters and documents which passed between the Classis of Amsterdam and the Dutch ministers in New York and New Jersey between 1628 and 1792, a period of one hundred and sixty-four years; and between the same Classis and the German ministers chiefly in Pennsylvania, between 1726 and 1793, a period of sixty-seven years. And of all the ecclesiastical correspondence between the colonial Churches and the parent Churches in Europe, probably this Amsterdam Correspondence represents an intercourse more regular and complete than any other.

The city of Amsterdam being the principal seaport of the Netherlands in the seventeenth century, the Classis of Amsterdam was made at an early period, the exact date of which has not yet been determined,[4] the general missionary agent of the Synod of North Holland, and virtually of the

[1] A somewhat parallel case is that of our present missionary Churches in heathen lands. Their future historians must seek the fullest details of their history in missionary correspondence and Acts of Boards and Churches in foreign lands.

[2] About five hundred volumes of important contemporary documents have been printed in England in the last generation. Hundreds of volumes of dissenting Churches have also been deposited, by request of Parliament, in Somerset House, London, for safe keeping and convenience of consultation.

[3] This title first began to be popularly used about 1875, when the letters and documents were transferred to the Sage Library at New Brunswick, N. J.

[4] This was probably soon after the Synod of Dort, 1619, which drew up elaborate instructions for the guidance of missionaries in the East. It is possible it may have been before that event.

entire Reformed Church of the Netherlands.[1] Indeed, other Reformed Churches of continental Europe, especially Swiss and German branches, and perhaps also certain portions of the Reformed Church of France, requested this Classis, from time to time, to act in the same capacity for them. The reason of this was that Holland's naval supremacy at that time, with her great maritime companies,[2] made intercourse easy with all parts of the world. That renowned Classis was, therefore, for two centuries, or until about the year 1800, the one foreign Missionary Board for the Reformed Church of all continental Europe.[3] She occupied a similar position toward the colonies and ministers, or missionaries of the whole Reformed Church, to that which the several British Societies subsequently occupied toward English colonies and missionaries.[4] She, however, represented the union of several national Churches in foreign work, while the British Societies represented in their foreign work the variety of denominations in a single nation. That Classis was the first great Missionary Board of Protestantism, and for a long time held this position alone. Besides attending to its own local duties, it had its famous committee on "Foreign Affairs," styled "*Ad res exteras*," which carried on an extensive correspondence with missionaries in Hindustan, Ceylon, Borneo, Java, and Formosa; with ministers in Cape Colony, Brazil, Guiana, St. John, St. Thomas, and Curaçoa[5]; as well as with those in New Netherland, and

[1] The Church of the Netherlands did not find it expedient at this time, owing to political complications, to hold a General Synod; but the several Particular (or Provincial) Synods were connected by *Deputati Synodi*.

[2] The Dutch East India Company existed from 1602–1795, and the West India Company from 1621–1795, when both were destroyed in connection with the French Revolution.

[3] The Lutheran Churches first operated through the Danish East India Company. The successful Danish-Halle Mission at Tranquebar was begun in 1709.

[4] The English East India Company was chartered in 1600. Its charter was amended in 1813, compelling it to allow missions within its domain. In 1857, after the great mutiny, the Company was dissolved, and India became a part of the Empire.

[5] Transcripts of all this material, relating to the West Indies and South America, ought to be secured and kept with that relating to New York as of special interest to Americans.

with the German ministers in Pennsylvania. Correspondence was also carried on with all the Reformed Churches of the continent.

ARCHIVES OF THE CLASSIS OF AMSTERDAM.

The Archives of the Classis of Amsterdam are, therefore, a perfect storehouse of historical material. They are located in the *Nieuwe Kerk*, by the side of the royal palace. There are found therein about one hundred folio volumes, closely written, and each containing nearly a thousand pages. The volumes are generally labelled according to the countries to which they relate, as Hungary, Borneo, Surinam, Pennsylvania, New Netherland, and so forth. Here are the Acts of the Classis since its formation in 1574. The letters of the Classis to foreign fields are recorded in these volumes as part of the *Acta* of the Classis. On the other hand, the letters received from foreign lands are not recorded, but are filed. Most of this correspondence is in the Dutch language. The letters to the German ministers are generally in the German language, although some are in Dutch and a score or more in Latin. A few Latin letters from Jesuit missionaries in central New York are also here found. Several of these Jesuits were protected or assisted by Dutch ministers from Indian barbarities, and this kindness was subsequently acknowledged.

A complete history of this Classis, with its wonderful missionary operations in all parts of the world, ought to be written, or at least an abstract of its proceedings given to the public. It would be a unique work, unequalled by that of any other Church or Society. Its material has already been partially used in the compilation of not a few works relating to the Church of Holland. One remarkable example, covering an obscure department of missionary history, we may be permitted to refer to. In 1884, Van Troostenburg de Bruyn, who had been a minister at Batavia, issued an elaborate work of more than seven hundred pages, octavo, entitled, *De Hervormde Kerk in Nederlansche Oost-Indië onder de Oost Indische Compaigne*, 1602–1795. This

volume gives an exhaustive account of those extensive but, perhaps, too much abused missions of the Dutch in the East Indies.

But what is not a little remarkable, no work of importance has ever been printed in Holland from these abundant records relating to the Reformed Church in America. Yet the principal development of the Reformed Church, outside of Europe, has been in the United States. The Dutch and German branches now represent nearly twenty-five hundred churches, nearly three hundred and fifty thousand communicants, and $25,000,000 of Church property. Multitudes have also gone from these Reformed Churches to swell the Episcopal, Presbyterian, and other bodies. Then, also, the Dutch, almost exclusively, represents the first half-century of the ecclesiastical life of the Empire State. And she laid not only the foundation of religion, but also of a superior jurisprudence[1] in this important centre, and her influence in both these respects has been felt through all the subsequent history of the state.

LACK OF HISTORICAL MATERIAL IN AMERICA.

But the Dutch, like most colonies, did not preserve elaborate material for Church history. The ministers were greatly overworked, having generally from three to six congregations to care for. Only occasionally was the correspondence with the parent Church recorded on the local Church-records. And there was no association of the Churches, with the records which such association would have produced, for one hundred and twenty years after the first Church was founded, or until 1747, when the so-called Coetus was formed, chiefly to facilitate American ordinations. But not all the Churches were willing to join this body, and then also its minutes have been preserved for only the first seven years. For seventeen years, or from 1754 to 1771, they are

[1] See Fowler on "Constitutional and Legal History of New York," in Wilson's *Memorial Hist. of the City of New York*, i., 523–538. (New York 1892–1893, 4 vols.) Dutch jurisprudence, founded on Roman Law, has ever been considered more humane than English jurisprudence.

lost. But full material for the history of all these early periods was preserved in Holland.

No sooner, however, had the country become independent than a few began to realize the necessity of collecting and preserving all the historical material existing in this country. In 1785,[1] therefore, the Synod directed that all letters which had been written, or should be written hereafter, should be recorded in a book kept for that purpose. Again, in 1792,[2] the year in which the Church adopted its first American Constitution, the Synod enjoined on the several Classes the duty of searching for all papers and minutes of former ecclesiastical bodies, and directed that brief accounts of the formation and history of all Churches should be prepared and transmitted to the Synod for preservation and as material for history. But nothing of importance resulted from this action. The fact that there was abundant material in Europe does not seem to have suggested itself to any mind; or if thought of, there is no recorded allusion to it until 1841.

But notwithstanding this apparent lack of material, the general history of the Church in connection with a few records was traditionally known for two or three generations, and the writing of its history was not altogether neglected. In 1804 the Rev. Dirck Romeyn published anonymously in the *Christians Magazine*,[3] a brief sketch of the Dutch Church in America, but necessarily dealt very meagrely upon its earlier history. A generation later some historical and biographical articles, connected with the history of the Church, appeared in Dr. William C. Brownlee's monthly *Magazine of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church*, 1826–1830.[4] In 1829, Dr. Gunn's stately volume on the

[1] *Minutes of Synod*, 1785, 135.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1792, 241. See also 1800, 311, 312, and *Minutes Particular Syn.*, 1794, 450.

[3] Vol. i, 365; ii., 1, 265. Dr. Romeyn at this time evidently had the Minutes of the Coetus 1747–53 in his possession. They were then lost sight of until 1841, when his grandsons delivered the volume to the General Synod. *Minutes Syn.*, 1841, 493; 1843, 272, 276.

[4] In vol. i. there are articles on the Church in the Netherlands; and in vols. ii. and iii. articles on the Church in the United States.

Life of Dr. John H. Livingston was published. This gave an excellent view of the history of the Church, especially during the period of his life; but the work was prepared largely from autobiographical notes, and from private papers. In 1830 began the weekly issue of the *Christian Intelligencer*, and articles of a historical and biographical kind not unfrequently occupied its pages. But the Church continued to mourn the lack of material for a complete history.[1] Circumstances, however, were developing which were to bring to light a considerable portion of the abundant material at Amsterdam.

CIVIL DOCUMENTS IN EUROPE.

The New York Historical Society had been founded in 1804 for the purpose of "collecting and preserving whatever may relate to the natural, civil, or ecclesiastical history of the United States in general, and of this State in particular." As early as 1814 this Society sent a memorial to the Legislature, requesting it to seek to obtain copies of all the official documents in the archives of state in Holland, England, and France relating to the State of New York. But this only led at that time to the translation of the Dutch records of the State, known as the *Albany Records*, and the classification and binding of the English records. The Dutch records at Albany[2] made twenty-six manuscript volumes, and the English records six hundred and sixty-one volumes and nine hundred bundles of papers.

In 1839, twenty-five years after the former memorial, the Historical Society sent a second petition to the Legislature, renewing their former request. This led, after two more years of delay, to the appointment of the Hon. J. Romeyn Brodhead as the agent of the State to collect official documents in Europe relating to her colonial history. He embarked on his mission May 1, 1841, and spent three years in

[1] *Minutes Syn.*, 1841, 491–3; 1843, 271–76.

[2] There are also many Dutch records in the cities of New York and Brooklyn which ought to be translated.

the work.[1] He brought back eighty manuscript volumes of transcripts, mostly in English, but many in the Dutch and French languages. Translations of these were made, and the whole was published in ten folio volumes, and are known as *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, 1856–58. Another volume containing an exhaustive Index was published in 1861. The State had previously, 1849–50, printed the four volumes of what is known as *The Documentary History of the State of New York*, from material previously on hand; and so interesting did these latter volumes prove, that a second edition was issued in 1856.[2] Now these two great works, issued by the State to elucidate her civil history, have also a remarkable value from an ecclesiastical point of view. They contain hundreds of articles and allusions to the ecclesiastical history of the colonial period.[3]

DISCOVERY OF THE AMSTERDAM CORRESPONDENCE.

But the appointment of Mr. Brodhead on his important mission excited also no little interest in Church circles. Previous to his departure, therefore,[4] Rev. Dr. Thomas DeWitt, one of the pastors of the Collegiate Church of the City of New York, suggested to him the propriety of seeking access to the archives of the Classis of Amsterdam, as well as to those of the Synod of North Holland,[5] to ascertain whether there was not material there which would throw light on the early history of the Church in New York. He cheerfully assented to the request. He was most kindly received by Rev. Mr. Prins, the Stated Clerk of the Classis,

[1] See his elaborate report to the Legislature in vol. i. of *Documents Relating to Colonial History*, General Introduction. Also his address before the New York Historical Society, 1844.

[2] The first edition consisted of four volumes, quarto. The second edition of four volumes, octavo.

[3] These ecclesiastical documents and allusions should be collected and printed in connection with a General Ecclesiastical Documentary History of the State.

[4] This was in April, 1841. See *Minutes of Synod*, 1843, 273.

[5] Mr. Brodhead does not seem to have examined the archives of the Synod of North Holland.

who readily submitted to his inspection the minutes and papers of that body. He soon discovered the large amount of valuable material already alluded to, and at once reported the facts to Dr. DeWitt. This was in the summer of 1841. The necessity of an extra session of the Synod in October, 1841, to elect a Professor of Theology in place of Dr. Milledoler, who had resigned, gave the opportunity for immediate action. Dr. DeWitt reported[1] the information received from Mr. Brodhead, and the Synod at once gave discretionary power to Dr. DeWitt and the Board of Corporation to have translations made of the documents discovered, at the expense of the Synod.

It did not, however, seem expedient to these gentlemen to attempt to have translations made in Holland, but Mr. Brodhead, through the Stated Clerk and Mr. Van den Broek, an elder in the Church and formerly United States Consul at Amsterdam, secured transcripts of the Acts of the Classis and of the recorded letters of the Classis relating to America, on sheets of uniform size.[2] These were subsequently elegantly bound in one large volume,[3] making about nine hundred pages.[4] Mr. Brodhead also obtained the loan of the original letters, so far as then found, which had been sent from America to the Classis. These had not been recorded, as before said, but were on file. The Synod was to have the use of these for four years, when they were to be safely returned.

Upon learning of the action of the Classis, and before the arrival of the material, the Synod of June, 1842,[5] expressed its warmest thanks to the Rev. Classis of Amsterdam for

[1] *Minutes of Synod*, Oct., 1841, 42.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1846, 167.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1843, 274; at an expense of $9, 1843, 176.

[4] The letters sent from America are more numerous than those sent from Holland, as the Classis could frequently reply to several American letters by one response. The American letters would represent about sixty to sixty-five per cent. of the whole correspondence. The total number of manuscript pages of the Amsterdam Correspondence, as at present possessed, would be considerably over two thousand.

[5] *Minutes of Synod*, 1842, 143.

the readiness with which they had granted the loan of the original letters, and for the facilities offered for the making of transcripts from their records. The hearty thanks of the Synod were also given to Mr. Brodhead for his agency in procuring the same. The documents were received in good order in the latter part of September, 1842.[1] The exact number then received is not known. The Synod has now about a thousand documents and letters, with a list of about twelve hundred. Besides the bound volume alluded to, there were seven bundles[2] of the original filed letters, two of which related to the German Churches in Pennsylvania. Says Dr. DeWitt concerning these filed letters: "They are particularly useful as to the earlier period of our Church, concerning which there is an almost entire dearth of information among ourselves. . . . It is desirable that these original documents should be in the permanent possession of the General Synod, if the Classis of Amsterdam can be induced to part with them. If they cannot be retained, the most important of them should be copied before their return to Holland."[3] The Synod at this same session resolved to open a correspondence with the Classis of Amsterdam, and appointed the Classis of New York as its committee to conduct it.[4]

In 1846 Dr. DeWitt proposed a visit to Europe to attend the first meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, which was about to be held in London. He informed the Synod of

[1] *Minutes of Synod*, Sept., 1843, 273.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1843, 274.

[3] It seems remarkable that these loaned letters were not arranged and copied in a volume at once. Now not a few of them are lost. The originals should never have been taken away from the archives in Amsterdam. That Classis now regrets their loss.

[4] *Minutes of Synod*, 1843, 257. The Classis of New York requested Dr. DeWitt to write the letter. This he did. It is dated March 9, 1844. In the following October the Classis of Amsterdam responded. See this letter in *Minutes of Synod*, 1845, 425, 519–522. It refers to the visit of Mr. Brodhead; to the modifications in their church government caused by the wars of Napoleon; it deprecates the recent secession of members from the State Church (the nucleus of the emigration to Michigan). The letter breathes a sweet evangelical spirit. The correspondence did not continue.

his intention to visit Holland while abroad, and again referred to the original letters which had been loaned to the Synod for four years. This period had now expired. He again emphasized the desirability of the Synod's owning these letters permanently. The Synod now cordially commended Dr. DeWitt to the confidence and affection of the brethren and the judicatories of the parent Church, and commissioned him to express the Synod's regard and desire to cultivate Christian fellowship by renewed correspondence, and appointed him to act as the Synod's delegate[1] in any of their judicatories if consistent with their rules. He was also requested to obtain, if possible, from the Classis of Amsterdam, the permanent possession of those documents which had been loaned to the Synod for a limited period, and was authorized to offer a reasonable consideration for them, if required.

Dr. DeWitt sailed on June 7, 1846, and was in Holland during the latter half of July. The shortness of his stay, with news of domestic affliction[2] at home, prevented him from making any special investigations. The Classis having previously heard of the desire of the Synod to retain the loaned documents, had already assigned the permanent ownership of them to the Synod.[3] The Classis would take no compensation for them, but if Dr. DeWitt should choose

[1] He was the only delegate sent to the Church of Holland by the Dutch Church in America during the first fifty years of the Church's complete independence. *Minutes of Synod*, 1846, 7, 28.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1847, 133, 134. He heard of the death of his son while abroad. He simply mentioned the matter one morning at the breakfast table to Dr. A. B. Van Zandt, who was with him, saying, "Tommy is dead; do not speak of it again." He attended a meeting of the Netherlands Missionary Society, but the General Synod had adjourned before he reached the Hague. He met several prominent ministers with whom he had corresponded, and with whose evangelical conversation he was edified. He also had an interview with Rev. Mr. Prins, the Stated Clerk of the Classis. He heard of the rising spirit of emigration to America among the seceders from the Established Church, and had a short interview with one of them, Rev. Mr. Scholte of Utrecht, who was about to proceed to America. Two colonies of Hollanders expected shortly to go to Michigan.

[3] Dr. DeWitt no doubt referred to this desire in his letter of March 9, 1844, to the Classis, but we have not seen it.

to make a donation to the Widow's Fund, it would be gladly received. He accordingly gave to the Classis twenty gold willems for the Widows' Fund.[1]

EARLY USE MADE OF THIS CORRESPONDENCE.

There is then no further allusion to this material in the Minutes of the General Synod for nineteen years, or until 1866, but in the meantime it was being diligently used by several parties.

Mr. Brodhead at once availed himself of it in the preparation of his invaluable history of the State of New York, but he only lived to publish two volumes, which brought the work down to 1691.[2] Dr. De Witt had been asked by the General Synod about the time of Mr. Brodhead's departure for Europe in 1841,[3] to write a short sketch of the history of the Church, with a general statement of its doctrines and government; and, at his convenience, a more elaborate history. He prepared a *Succinct History*, which was issued in 1848. He attempted by a circular 'letter'[4] to gain more particular information from all parts of the Church, but was disappointed in the results. In the meantime this material from Holland arrived, and he determined from it to write

[1] The General Synod also sent two complete (?) sets of their Minutes, bound in six volumes, to Holland, one for the Classis of Amsterdam, and one for the General Synod of Holland, and received one set of their Minutes (1816–45) in return. *Minutes of General Synod*, 1845, 487; 1847, 143, 144.

[2] Volume one was issued in 1853, and volume two in 1871. Volume three was about ready for the press, when Mr. Brodhead died. This third volume would have brought the history down to 1705, covering a most important period, including the so-called Ministry Act of 1693, and the Charters of the Dutch Church, 1696, and of Trinity Church, 1697, and the important civil legislation connected with the latter, especially in 1704. This volume ought yet to be recovered, edited by a competent hand, and issued. See vol. viii., 64–128 of American Church History Series, which partly covers this period; and Dr. E. B. Coe's Address at the Bicentenary of the Charter of Reformed Dutch Church in New York, 1896.

[3] *Minutes of Synod*, 1841, 491, 492, 493. The Particular Synod of New York suggested this request. *Minutes of Particular Synod*, 1841, 28.

[4] *Ibid.*, 1843, 271–7. This Circular was also published in *Christian Intelligencer.*

a somewhat elaborate history down to the Revolution. But while engaged in the study of this material, in connection with his pastoral and pulpit work, he experienced one or more slight paralytic strokes, which disabled him temporarily, and ultimately prevented him from carrying out his design. He translated a number of the letters of the Amsterdam Correspondence, some of which were printed in the *Documentary History of New York*, and others in the *Christian Intelligencer*. A number of fugitive articles of his on historical topics remain,[1] chiefly in the periodicals of the day. He constructed also the first approximately complete list of the ministers of the Dutch Church in America down to the year 1800. This is printed in an appendix to a Historical Discourse delivered by him in 1856, at the reopening of the Fulton Street Church after extensive repairs.

The New York Historical Society also printed a few of these letters as well as several articles founded on them, in the volumes of their Proceedings.[2]

The Hon. Henry C. Murphy also used some of this material in his unique volume entitled *The Anthology of New Netherland*, a limited edition of which was printed by the Bradford Club in 1865. It was Mr. Murphy, also, who brought to light in 1858 the elaborate letter[3] of Jonas Michaelius, 1628, the first minister of the Dutch Church in America, whose name had been entirely lost.

And, finally, Rev. Henry Harbaugh seems to have used that part of this material which related to the German ministers in Pennsylvania, in the preparation of his very interesting volumes, *The Fathers of the Reformed Church in*

[1] See list of his publications on page 241 of the *Manual*, 1879.

[2] On Feb. 20, 1878, George H. Moore, Librarian of the Lenox Library, writes that he had some years before tried to obtain the Amsterdam Correspondence for the use of the Historical Society. He says it was then in the custody of Mr. Brodhead. He also refers to Mr. Murphy's use of some of the letters relating to Selyns. He adds that, no doubt, the Historical Society would be glad to print such letters as were of historical interest.

[3] Printed in *Manual* of 1879, pp. 3–10. A fac-simile of this letter and a revised translation was printed by the Collegiate Church of New York in their Year-Book, 1896. Mr. Murphy also brought several other documents to light.

Europe and America, which were issued in 1857, as well as in his *Life of Rev. Michael Schlatter*. During all this time, and, indeed, down to 1870, a period of twenty-eight years, these documents were in possession of Dr. De Witt and Mr. Brodhead.[1]

In the meantime, however, others had been at work on the history of the Church, although without the direct use of these documents. In 1856 Rev. Dr. David D. Demarest issued the first edition of his work, entitled *The History and Characteristics of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church.* In 1859 Rev. E. T. Corwin issued the first edition of *The Manual of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church.* Shortly after[2] the Minutes of the Coetus, 1737, 1747–1753, and Conferentie (1755–67) were published, with some of the Correspondence of that period, so far as it was recorded in these minutes; together with the Minutes of the old Provisional Synod, 1771–1792, and of the General Synod, 1794–1812. There were also included in this volume the minutes of the original Particular Synod of the whole Church, 1793–1799. All these publications were found very interesting, and stimulated the desire to write the histories of local churches, and such histories began to multiply.

Considerable desire, therefore, began now to be expressed that the Amsterdam Correspondence should be made accessible to all historical inquirers. Accordingly, in 1866,[3] resolutions were introduced in the General Synod appointing a committee to suggest a plan for the collection and preserva-

[1] Several of these letters have been printed in recent publications.

[2] Rev. Wm. Demarest was engaged by the Synod in 1857 to translate the Dutch Minutes of the Provisional Synod, from 1770–1792. This translation, before its publication, was used in the preparation of the first edition of the *Manual*. Dr. T. W. Chambers then translated the Minutes of the Coetus and Conferentie, so far as possessed, and prefixed them to Rev. Wm. Demarest's translation. The Minutes of the General Synod, already in English, from 1794–1812, were added to this volume, and the whole was printed, and is known as Volume One of *Minutes of General Synod*. There is considerable error in the arrangement of the material and in the editing of this volume. The Minutes of 1793 belong to those of the original Particular Synod; and its session of Oct., 1799, is entirely missed.

[3] *Minutes of Synod*, 1866, 112, 113; 1869, 677.

tion of documents relating to the past history of the Church. The Stated Clerk was also now authorized to allow the New York Historical Society to translate and publish this Correspondence. But nothing resulted immediately from these acts of the Synod. In 1869 a second edition of the *Manual of the Reformed Church in America* was issued in an enlarged form, with various improvements, and so greatly was the interest in historical studies increasing that the thousand copies of this second edition were exhausted in four months. Not until 1870 did the material of the Amsterdam Correspondence pass into the hands of the Stated Clerk[1] of the General Synod, and the following resolution was passed:

"*Resolved*, That the thanks of the Synod be given to the Rev. Dr. Thomas DeWitt and the Hon. J. Romeyn Brodhead for the care taken by them for several years of the Correspondence between the churches of this country and the Classis of Amsterdam."[2]

TRANSLATION OF THE CORRESPONDENCE.

With the building of the Gardner A. Sage Library at New Brunswick in 1875, a fire-proof room was constructed for the Archives of the General Synod. The Minute Books and papers of the Synod were now removed from the Consistory-room of the Collegiate Church, at 103 Fulton Street, New York (the room of the famous Fulton Street Prayer Meeting), where they had been kept by the courtesy of that Consistory since 1845,[3] a period of thirty years, to this secure

[1] Not all of it, even then. Portions of it were subsequently found by the writer, and deposited in the archives.

[2] *Minutes of Synod*, 1871, 356. Dr. DeWitt was now eighty years old. He died in 1874, respected and loved by everybody. Mr. Brodhead died in 1877, aged sixty-seven. He was the son of Rev. Dr. Jacob Brodhead, who was a colleague of Dr. DeWitt. A sketch of Hon. J. Romeyn Brodhead, by Dr. Chambers, is found in *Scribner's Monthly*, 1877.

[3] The history of the Archives is briefly as follows: Besides the allusions before made to them in 1785 and 1792 it was also ordered in 1800 that the minister in whose church the Synod was next to meet should be held responsible for the safe keeping of the records. In 1806 all papers and records were put in the care of the Stated Clerk. In 1815 a new lemma (or heading) was introduced in the Minutes of Synod, called "Synodical Archives." Besides the

apartment. *In this place also was now deposited the* Amsterdam Correspondence. In this same year there was a committee appointed by the Synod, called the Committee of Co-operation. In conjunction with the Faculty,[1] they were to expend, in the purchase of books for the Sage Library, certain moneys which had been given for this purpose. This Committee soon called the attention of the Synod to the worth of the Amsterdam Correspondence and of certain historical pamphlets and volumes in the Dutch language, published during the middle of the eighteenth century, and some of which had only recently come to light.[2] The Committee asked permission to have the Correspondence and these printed works translated at the expense of the Library Fund. This was granted. The Committee appointed Rev. Drs. Corwin and Van Zandt a sub-committee to secure these translations. Arrangements were made with Rev. Maurice G. Hansen to translate the printed works, and with certain theological students of Dutch descent to translate the letters. Only about eighty per cent. of the letters

records and papers, publications of Dutch ministers and a few other volumes, manuscript or printed, have been donated to the Archives. The references to action respecting them are as follows: *Minutes of Synod*, 1785, 135; 1792, 241; 1800, 278, 311, 312; 1806, 360; 1814, 18, 55; 1815, 51, 53; 1816, 43; 1831, 389; 1832, 23, 24, 100, 142; 1833, 163-4; 1841, 535; 1843, 272; 1845, 487, 518; 1860, 486; 1862, 215; 1863, 367; 1866, 112, 113; 1869, 677; 1871, 356; 1873, 767; 1874, 165; 1875, 369; 1876, 568-9; 1877, 748; 1878, 160; 1879, 421; 1880, 609; 1881, 812; 1882, 177; 1883, 377-8; 1884, 576; 1885, 794; 1886, 195; 1892, 574. Since 1886 Article XXIV, "Archives" in *Minutes of Synod*, contains the necrology of the ministry.

[1] The Faculty at this time consisted of Rev. Drs. S. M. Woodbridge, John DeWitt, D. D. Demarest, and A. B. Van Zandt; the Committee of Co-operation, of Rev. Drs. T. W. Chambers, C. D. Hartranft, and E. T. Corwin. In 1878 Dr. Hartranft removed to Hartford, and Rev. Dr. Jacob Cooper was appointed in his place. Meetings were held once a month for ten years, and books, amounting to $60,000, were added to the Sage Library.

[2] *Minutes of General Synod*, 1876, 528. These volumes consisted of the "Klagte," or Complaint, against Frelinghuysen, 1725, p. 146; half a dozen pamphlets, *pro* and *con*, respecting the independence of the Church, 1761-5, by Leydt and Ritzema; a Dialogue between Considerans and Candidus, by Van Santvoord, 1726, pp. 214. Freeman's "Verdegiging" or Defence against the Church of Rartan, 1726, 18mo., p. 126, has come to light since, and has not yet been translated.

were translated.[1] The total expense of this work was about $600. A full Index[2] of all this material was now made, showing what documents were on hand; what ones were only referred to; what ones had been translated previously and by whom; and what ones at the present time by students; what documents had been printed, and in what publications they were to be found; and what original documents were missing,—only English translations remaining. From the time of translation this material has been frequently consulted by historical inquirers, and not a few extracts have also been sent to those at a distance.[3] From this and other material the history of *The Church in the Colonial Period*[4] was prepared, as one of the Twenty-two Discourses found in the volume styled *Centennial Discourses of the Reformed* [*Dutch*] *Church in America*, which was issued in 1876. This history, after revision, was incorporated in the third edition of the *Manual*, 1879.

The Committee of Co-operation now asked permission of the Synod to print such portions of this correspondence and

[1] These students then finished their course at the Seminary. The translations, having been made by different hands, are of unequal value, and need revision.

[2] This Index was made in preparation for the third edition of the *Manual*. Until 1896, but one copy of the Index was in existence. Dr. Chambers requested, only a couple of months before his death (1896), that a copy should be made for the Collegiate Church Library. This was done, and the copy was deposited there on the 200th anniversary of their charter.

[3] We note especially Rev. Dr. Chas. W. Baird, who frequently wrote (1877–1881) for information in preparing his history of the Huguenot Emigration to America (N. Y., 1885, 2 vols.). He was anxious to see the Amsterdam Correspondence printed.

[4] This was prepared at the request of Dr. Chambers. See *Minutes of General Synod*, 1875, 355–6; 1876, 551–3; 1877, 733–4. He had, about 1874, translated the Minutes of the Collegiate Church of New York, making two manuscript volumes. He loaned these to the writer, who found them very useful in the preparation of the history alluded to. On October 6, 1876, the writer began a series of articles in the *Christian Intelligencer* on the bibliography of the ministers and laymen of the Dutch Church. It was continued for about a year, bringing the material down to the letter G. It was continued in reference to ministers in the *Manual* of 1879. In 1877 Dr. Chambers writes that his Consistory consents to the use of $100 of their Library Fund toward translating letters relating to the Collegiate Church. Similar action in 1886.

of the Dutch volumes before alluded to as they might deem proper.[1] This was granted provided the funds were raised by private subscription; but neither the originals nor the translations were to be taken from the Library except under the direction of the Committee. Several plans were now proposed and some efforts made to raise funds to secure the publication of this material, which was voluminous, but without success.

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL DISCOVERED.

In the meantime it was discovered that not all the material belonging to this correspondence had been brought to this country in 1842. Rev. Roswell Randall Hoes, a chaplain in the Navy and a devoted student of colonial Church history, had visited Holland in 1885 and sought out the archives of the Classis of Amsterdam. On a cursory examination he discovered a portfolio of three hundred and fifty-three letters, which the parties employed by Mr. Brodhead to make the search had evidently missed. Some of the missing minutes of the Coetus were noticed in this lot. There were also many other historical facts in the records of the Classis, relating to the American Churches, of which no copies had been secured.[2] Strangers to the details of American Church history could hardly have been expected to identify all desirable documents.

Mr. Hoes reported these facts to the Synod of 1887.[3] The Synod heartily thanked him for his interesting statement of these discoveries, which promised to throw additional light on the early history of the Church. Learning at the same time that Rev. Dr. Corwin was on the eve of starting to Europe and intended to visit Holland, the Synod commended him to the confidence of friends abroad and empowered him "to negotiate for said manuscripts, and to bring them, if due arrangements can be made, to this

[1] *Minutes Synod*, 1878, 224, 99; 1879, 399, 362.

[2] Several other recent explorers of these archives have noticed that there was considerable material which had not been secured in 1842.

[3] *Minutes Synod*, 1887, 440–42.

country." The Synod also directed that this new material, if obtained, as well as the material already in this country should be entrusted to the custody of Rev. Drs. Chambers, Demarest, and Corwin for translation and publication.

Dr. Corwin spent a week in Amsterdam in August, 1887, and had free access to the archives and examined the material alluded to. He could not, however, secure a meeting of the Classis of Amsterdam, as all the ministers, except two, were out of the city on their summer vacation.[1] He, therefore, addressed a communication to the Classis, explaining the wish of the Synod to obtain any additional material relating to the American churches, referring to the material formerly obtained by Mr. Brodhead in 1842, and of the ultimate gift to the Synod of the loaned letters; of the translation of the material on hand into English and the design to print all, when the collection was completed, for the elucidation of our early American Church history.[2] This letter was translated into Dutch and fifty copies printed, and arrangements made for their distribution among the members of the Classis. The Classis subsequently responded, expressing their joy at the interest manifested in such historical studies in America, and their willingness to facilitate all such efforts by any means in their power; but they regretted their inability to comply with the Synod's request, for they had learned by sad experience that it was unsafe to loan letters. They had consequently made a rule that no letters or documents should go out of their hands on loan; and as for selling them, they could not even consider the matter as they belonged to the "Universitas." They would be happy, however, to furnish every facility for transcription. Signed by G. J. Vos, Az., Sec.

[1] The writer went from Amsterdam to Domburg to visit Dr. Vos, the Stated Clerk of the Classis, to explain matters more fully, and was most courteously received.

[2] *Minutes Synod*, 1888, 685-6.

EFFORTS TO HAVE THE CORRESPONDENCE PRINTED.

In the meantime hopes had been held out by the keeper of the Historical Records at Albany, and who had published three additional volumes of *Colonial Documents Relating to the State of New York* (1877–1883), that the Amsterdam Correspondence might, perhaps, be legitimately printed in this series of volumes. He had already incorporated several of the letters, which had been furnished him for this purpose, in these recently issued volumes. The Synod of 1887[1] had recognized the services of Mr. Fernow, and had requested the committee, to whom they had entrusted the care of these documents, to secure the further services of Mr. Fernow in translating any of the new material which might be obtained, as well as any of the old yet needing to be translated. Accordingly in September, 1887, the original material and the translations, so far as made, were taken to the Capitol at Albany and left in the charge of Mr. Fernow for revision and completion of translations, with a view to their publication in the volumes of the *Colonial Documents*. Upon examination, however, he considered it best to make new translations from the beginning,[2] and had proceeded in the work down to the year 1740, having made about a thousand pages of translation, when, through the fluctuations of politics, his position, long and usefully held by him, and for which he was peculiarly well qualified, was given to another (1889).[3] The hope of publishing them in this way, therefore, came to an end. The documents were safely returned in August, 1890, to the archives in New Brunswick, N. J.

In 1890 the Synod again requested the Committee having these documents in charge, "either by the co-operation of some existing society, or by a periodical issue, monthly or quarterly, to secure the publication of these historical records,

[1] *Minutes of Synod*, 1887, 441.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1890, 196.

[3] In 1889 a new edition, entirely rewritten, of Dr. Demarest's work was published under the title *The Reformed Church in America: Its Origin, Development, and Characteristics*. 8vo, pp. 215.

of priceless value, that they may be accessible " to all.[1] The matter was again discussed, but no practical result was reached, and the whole matter again remained in abeyance for several years.[2]

NEW MOVEMENT TO COMPLETE THE MATERIAL AND PUBLISH IT.

In 1895 several circumstances occurred which led to a renewed consideration of the subject. Rev. Mr. Hoes, also, now informed the Synod's Committee that the Historical Commission of New Jersey, which had already published seventeen volumes of documents, styled *The Archives of New Jersey*, had offered to print this correspondence, especially when the additional material was obtained from Holland, and the translations were revised and completed and the whole properly edited and made ready for the press. This led to the call of a meeting, by the Synod's Committee having charge of the material, of a few gentlemen, who, it was believed, would take a special interest in this matter. The design of the meeting was stated to be to consider the practicability of securing the balance of the Amsterdam Correspondence from Holland and of combining it with that already possessed for publication. There had hitherto been no generally organized effort to secure these results. The meeting was held on June 1, 1896. After full discussion, resolutions were adopted concerning the importance of collecting all available material relating to the early ecclesiastical history of New York and New Jersey, and of

[1] *Minutes of Synod*, 1890, 196.

[2] In 1892 the Presbyterian Historical Society called the attention of the Synod to the necessity of collecting and preserving documents concerning the history of the Church, and asked for the appointment of a committee to co-operate with them to this end, and offered the use of their fire-proof vault for the preservation of any documents. The Synod expressed its approbation of the cause, but stated that it had a fire-proof room of its own, and offered the Society every facility for the transcript of any document desired. At the same time it appointed Revs. E. T. Corwin, A. Krickaard, J. F. Riggs, and Elders W. H. Kirk and George Lott a committee " to secure more fully and to preserve in the Gardner A. Sage Library vaults any documents of value to our own branch of the Church."—*Minutes of Synod*, 1892, 574.

translating and publishing the same in accordance with the often expressed wish of the General Synod; that to perform this work satisfactorily, it was deemed necessary to send a competent agent to Holland, whose familiarity with the subject would enable him readily to decide what documents should be selected, without duplication of material already on hand, from the archives of the Classis of Amsterdam as well as from those of the Synods of North and South Holland; that a committee be appointed to carry out the purpose indicated in the foregoing resolutions, who should have authority to solicit funds and to send out such an agent; and that Rev. Drs. D. D. Demarest, E. T. Corwin and R. R. Hoes (the Synod's committee), together with Rev. Dr. E. B. Coe, be said committee, with power to add to their number. It was estimated that about $5000 would be needed to secure the services of an agent familiar with the subject, to make an exhaustive research of the archives in Holland, and to prepare the material for the press; and that probably a couple of years would be necessary for all this work.

The Synod's committee made a report to the Synod which met in Catskill in June, 1896, reviewing some of the chief facts relating to this correspondence, such as the time and manner of its acquisition, its translation, the efforts to secure its publication and their failure, the value of the material, the new material recently discovered, and the new hope that it might be printed in the *Archives of New Jersey*. The Synod thereupon appointed Rev. Dr. E. B. Coe on its committee in this business in place of Dr. Chambers, deceased, and adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That this committee be requested to press forward this matter as rapidly as convenient, in the ways indicated, and that if an agent be sent to Holland for the above expressed purposes, that the President and Stated Clerk give him credentials from this body."[1]

The Committee of the Conference of June 1st, which was now identical with the Synod's committee, met again on

[1] *Minutes of Synod*, 1896, 499, 500.

June 22d, and the following named gentlemen were added to the Committee of the Conference:

Rev. David Cole, D.D., of Yonkers; Rev. J. Howard Suydam, D.D., of Rhinebeck; Rev. Joachim Elmendorf, D.D., of New York; Rev. Daniel Van Pelt, D.D., of Astoria; and Messrs. Gerard Beekman, of New York; S. D. Coykendall, of Kingston; Gen. William S. Stryker, of Trenton; William Nelson, of Paterson; Frederic Frelinghuysen, of Newark; J. Townsend Lansing, of Albany; and William L. Brower, W. H. Jackson and A. V. W. Van Vechten, of New York.

Rev. Dr. Coe was made president, Rev. Dr. Corwin, secretary, and Wm. L. Brower, treasurer. The draft of a circular was then presented, amended and adopted, in which the meaning of the "Amsterdam Correspondence" was explained, and the new material discovered was referred to. The worth of the correspondence, the work of translation, thus far accomplished, the offer of the Historical Commission of New Jersey, the conference in New York, the report to Synod and Synod's action were all referred to as well as the amount needed for the work. It was then proposed that the sum required should be divided into $100 shares, and an appeal was made for the funds needed.[1]

CONCLUSION.

Such is the general history of the Amsterdam Correspondence. The Church had long mourned over a lack of material for its early history when suddenly these unexpected treasures came to light. But for a generation they remained in private hands, and were, therefore, used only to a limited extent. But then a desire began to be expressed that they should be made available, and action was taken accordingly. Until their removal to New Brunswick no systematic effort was made for their translation; and since their translation, all efforts to secure their printing have hitherto failed. The reasons are obvious. But few appreciate the worth of con-

[1] Up to December, 1896, only about $1200 have been subscribed for this enterprise.

temporary documents, and the voluminous character of this material would involve considerable outlay. The correspondence on hand would make a closely printed octavo of at least a thousand pages, without including the printed pamphlets and works before alluded to, which would add five hundred pages more. The new material from Holland would still further swell the work.

But the importance of securing all material, while it is possible, and making it available by publication, cannot be exaggerated. The colonial period was a formative period and is replete with interest. A new and exhaustive search ought to be made, in the light of our present knowledge, not only of the Archives of the Classis of Amsterdam, but of the Synods of North and South Holland,[1] and of some of the other Classes in reference to particular men and topics. And then this new material together with the articles and allusions in the *Documentary History of New York* and in the *Colonial Documents Relating to the State of New York*, ought to be combined with the old "Amsterdam Correspondence" and the whole be printed and indexed and given to the public.[2] A full and exhaustive history, dispassionately written, of the entire ecclesiastical situation in New York prior to the Revolution is a desideratum. The correspondence under consideration, besides its own independent value, touches continually on passing events. Without it we cannot understand the period of the Dutch régime, with its many peculiar conditions; and still less the remarkable complications in ecclesiastical affairs under the English rule. The Dutch successfully resisted every effort to impose a

[1] The archives of the Synod of North Holland are at Amsterdam; those of South Holland, at Rotterdam; those of the General Synod are at the Hague, but these latter would not be of much service.

[2] Still better would it be if all the ecclesiastical documents relating to every denomination, of the colonial period of New York and New Jersey, could be brought together in one work, together with the civil legislation and judicial decisions on ecclesiastical cases. Some additional material in connection with the Ministry Act and its sequels would have to be sought in England. The Journal of the Governor and his Council reveals much attempted legislation on church matters by different parties which was never enacted.

Church Establishment upon the province, although the Ministry Act was perverted in favor of such an establishment. But it is doubtful whether all this material relating to our colonial Church history can be acquired and published, unless some individual of means, or one of our older churches, or some Historical or other Society, provides the way for its realization.

JOHN ELIOT, THE PURITAN MISSIONARY TO THE INDIANS.

A Paper read before the American Society of Church History at its ninth annual meeting, Dec. 30th, 1896.

JOHN ELIOT, THE PURITAN MISSIONARY TO THE INDIANS.[1]

By EZRA HOYT BYINGTON, D.D.,

Newton, Massachusetts.

SPECIAL attention has been called recently to the life and work of the Apostle Eliot by the observance of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of his first preaching to the Indians. New facts have been brought to light by recent investigations in respect to his life and work. It is quite possible at this time to form a more intelligent idea of his missions, and of their results, than it was even a generation ago. He is no longer regarded as an isolated missionary, a gifted and saintly man who stood quite apart from his environment; and entered upon a work which the men of his time did not appreciate; but rather as one who sought to carry out in definite and practical ways a missionary idea, which the Puritans had long before accepted, and which a number of other men among the Colonists were also seeking to carry to successful results.

John Eliot was one of the first generation of the ministers of New England. He was born in Widford, Hertfordshire, England, near the borders of Essex, a county from which a large number of the early settlers of New England came. Widford is a small parish, twenty-five miles north from London. The exact date of his birth is not known, but after much inquiry, the record of his baptism has been found in the parish register of the Church of St. John Baptist in Widford. It is as follows: "John Elliott the son of

[1] Permission to re-publish is reserved by the author.

Bennett Elliott was baptized the 5th day of August, in the year of our Lord God 1604." [1]

Not much can be learned of his parents, Bennett Eliot and Lettice Aggar. They were married in Widford, October 30th, 1598. His father belonged to an old and reputable family, which had branches in a number of the counties of England. It is said to have descended from Sir William De Aliot, a Norman Knight, who came over with William the Conqueror.[2] There is reason to believe that he was also a relative of Sir John Eliot, the great Parliamentary leader, of the time of Charles II. Bennett Eliot was a landowner in a number of parishes in Essex. His will shows that he had a large estate for those times. In this will he made provision for paying the expenses of the education of his children, and especially for the education of his son John, who was a student at Cambridge when his father died.[3]

John Eliot was the third child in a family of seven. The family seem to have been Nonconformists, though not by any means Separatists. They probably attended at St. John Baptist Church, a venerable building even in the years of his childhood, for parts of it are said to be eight hundred years old. It is interesting to note that a memorial window, to commemorate the Apostle to the Indians, has recently been placed in the chancel of that old church, at the expense of his American descendants.[4]

We know very little of his childhood. He tells us only this: that his first years "were seasoned with the fear of God, the Word and prayer." From the Baptismal register at Nasing, Essex, we learn that the younger children of the family were baptized in the church in that parish, a fact which led a number of those who have written of the life of Eliot to state that he was born in Nasing. The influence of the Nonconformists must have been especially strong at Nasing, and this young man was moulded by that influence.

[1] *New England Historic Genealogical Register*, 1894, page 402.

[2] *Eliot Genealogy*, New Haven, Ct., 1854, ii., 30–35.

[3] *N. E. Genealogical Register*, 1894, 39–68.

[4] *N. E. Historic Genealogical Register*, 1894, p. 80. *Boston Evening Transcript*, June 16, 1896.

He was matriculated as a pensioner at Jesus College, Cambridge, March 20, 1619, and received the degree of A.B. in 1622.[1] He had the reputation at Cambridge of being an excellent scholar, especially in the classics.

Not much is recorded of the nine years that followed his graduation. He was for a time an usher in the Grammar School at Little Baddow, Essex: then under the principalship of Thomas Hooker, afterwards so distinguished in New England as a preacher and an author. The influence upon him of this eminent Puritan, who was older than Eliot by eighteen years, was very great. He always spoke of the time of his residence at Little Baddow as the beginning of his religious life. "To this place was I called," he said, "through the infinite riches of God's mercy, for here the Lord said to my dead soul, Live; and through the grace of Christ, I do live, and I shall live forever. When I came to this blessed family, I then saw, and never before, the power of godliness in its lively vigor and efficiency."[2] While at this place he decided to become a preacher of the gospel. But he could not preach the gospel, as he understood it, in England, at that time. Mr. Hooker, himself, was compelled to flee into Holland, and finally to go to New England. A number of the personal friends of Mr. Eliot were making preparations to follow Governor Winthrop to New England, and they invited this young Nonconformist to become their minister, in the new country. There is some reason to believe that he had been ordained before he left England, but there is no decisive evidence of this.

He sailed for New England in the ship *Lyon*, "in the ninth month," we are told, and was landed in Boston November 3, 1631. He had as fellow passengers, Mrs. Margaret Winthrop, the wife of Governor Winthrop, and his eldest son and some of his younger children,[3] and more than fifty others who went to join the Massachusetts Colony.

Mr. Eliot was now twenty-seven years of age. The Church

[1] *Protestant Missions*, Dr. Thompson, Note 8, p. 53, Appendix.
[2] *Life of Eliot*, Dr. Nehemiah Adams, 1870, p. 47.
[3] *The Puritan in England and New England*, Dr. Byington, 232.

in Boston was at the time without a minister, as their pastor, Mr. Wilson, was absent in England, and Mr. Eliot was at once employed as his substitute. His services were so acceptible to the congregation, that he was invited to become the teacher of the Church, in connection with Mr. Wilson, the pastor.[1] The next year, however, his friends from Essex county came over, and settled in Roxbury. They claimed the fulfilment of his promise to devote himself to their service. Mr. Eliot thereupon declined the proposals of the people in Boston, and was settled as teacher of the Church in Roxbury, November 5, 1632. His pastorate at that place lasted until his death almost sixty years afterwards. He had been married about a month before his settlement to Hannah Mumford, a lady to whom he had been engaged in England. Much of his success as a pastor and as a missionary was due to the rare wisdom and efficiency of his wife, whose life of eighty-four years was ended only a short time before that of her husband.

The ministry of Mr. Eliot in Roxbury was much like that of the other Puritan pastors of that time in New England. He was a very able and well read man, a student of the principles of government as well as of theology. He received an annual salary of £60, a sum less than some of the other ministers of the vicinity received, though larger than that of the majority. The President of Harvard College received at that time only £100.

Mr. Eliot was a close student of the Bible, and an earnest and faithful preacher, as well as an affectionate and devoted pastor. He held the Puritan theology, and preached it. His church, like the other churches of the colony, had two ministers, a part of the time, one of whom was called a pastor, and the other a teacher. But Mr. Eliot was the only minister for two-thirds the time of his period of service. All his missionary work was done in connection with his pastoral work. Sometimes the other ministers of the vicinity were able to preach for him while he went to preach to the Indians. He was so fond of the Hebrew language that he

[1] See Winthrop's *Journal*, vol. i., p. 93.

used to say that it was better fitted than any other to be the universal language. He was quite sure it would be the language of Heaven. "He was distinguished," says one of his biographers, "for facetiousness and affability." His conversation was sprinkled with wit. He had a special interest in young people. The little children loved him. He was interested in the public schools, and succeeded in establishing a Free School in Roxbury, for the support of which he bequeathed a part of his estate. His preaching was very simple and plain, so that, as Cotton Mather says, in his quaint way, "the very lambs might wade into his discourses on those texts and themes wherein elephants might swim." "His manner was commonly gentle and winning, but when sin was to be rebuked, or corruption combated, his voice swelled into solemn and powerful energy. On such occasions there were as many thunderbolts as words."

In the early years of his pastorate at Roxbury he was in contact from day to day with the Indians. They used to come frequently into the villages of the Colonists, and into their cabins. Sometimes they had articles of their own making to sell. They were an imitative race, and were disposed to copy the manners of the white people. There had been no serious hostilities between them and the Colonists in this part of the country. The Puritans had from the beginning cherished a plan for converting the savages to the Christian faith. Governor Bradford in his *History* of Plymouth tells us that one reason for coming to New England was "a great hope and inward zeall of laying some foundation, or making way for propagating ye kingdom of Christ, to the remote parts of ye world."[1] The charter of the Colony of Massachusetts states that it was the principal end of the Plantation to "Winn and incite the natives of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the onlie true God and Saviour of Mankinde, and the Christian Faythe." The seal of the Colony had the figure of an Indian with the words, "come over and help us."

[1] Bradford's *History*, page 24, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 4th series, vol. iii.

It was not practicable to establish Indian missions in the earlier years of these colonies. The struggle for existence was too intense. But the Colonists were from time to time teaching the natives religious truth, and even in the earlier years a few of them became Christians. As early as 1632 Roger Williams began to study the languages of the Indians who lived in the vicinity of Plymouth, and a few years later he published his *Key* to the languages of the Indians of America. Other ministers were using such means as they had to learn to converse with the Indians.

When Mr. Eliot began to learn the Indian tongue he found a young Indian living in Dorchester who was exactly fitted to become his teacher. He says: "God first put into my heart a compassion over their poor souls, and a desire to teach them to know Christ, and to bring them into His Kingdome. Then presently I found out a pregnant-witted young man, who had been a servant in an English house, who pretty well understood our language, and well understood his own language, and hath a clear pronunciation. Him I made my Interpreter."[1] He also tells us that this young Indian belonged to Long Island, and that he had been taken prisoner, and had lived with Mr. Calicott of Dorchester. "This Indian," he tells us, "can read, and I taught him to write, which he quickly learnt. He was the first one I made use of to teach me words. By his help I translated the Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and many texts of Scripture; also I compiled both exhortations and prayers by his help. I diligently marked the difference of their grammar from ours. When I found the way of them, I would pursue a word, a noun, a verb, through all the variations I could think of. We must not sit still and wait for miracles. Up, and be doing, and the Lord will be with thee. Prayer and pains through faith in Christ Jesus will do everything."[2] This interpreter has been recently identified as Cockenöe, a well known Indian of Long Island, who

[1] See a note at the end of his *Indian Grammar*, Cambridge 1666.

[2] See the same note.

was a very intelligent interpreter in that country for many years of his later life.[1]

In this simple and natural way the pastor at Roxbury was preparing himself to preach to the Indians. Other pastors in the vicinity were doing the same thing at that time. All recognized the duty of preaching to the heathen at their very doors. As early as 1636 the Plymouth Colony had enacted laws to provide for the preaching of the gospel among the Indians who were living within their bounds. In November, 1644, the General Court of Massachusetts, asked the ministers of the Colony to give their opinions as to the best means of evangelizing the Indians. In 1646 the same legislative body directed the ministers to select each year two of their number to engage in missionary work among the Indians. This called general attention to the matter, and was the signal for an onward movement. The time for a great effort seemed to have come. People were talking about it and praying for its success. The idea of Indian missions was in the air. The men to lead the work were already trained, and were finding their way to the people who needed their help. Among them was Thomas Mayhew, a merchant who settled on the island of Martha's Vineyard in 1643, and his son, an educated minister, who came to the Island a year or two later. These two learned to speak the language of the natives, and they became successful missionaries among them. There were others who entered upon missionary work a little later, one of them as far south as Delaware.

Mr. Eliot had the assistance of several interpreters in his study of the Indian language. Job Nesutan was one of the most useful of them, and we learn that he became a member of the church in Dorchester.[2] Their method was this: having an English sentence, they would find out the Indian words to make up the sentence, learn the order of the words, as

[1] John Eliot's *First Indian Teacher and Interpreter, Cockenōe de Long Island*, W. W. Tooker. New York: Harper's, 1896.

[2] Francis' *Life*, p. 40, note.

well as the words themselves, and their inflections. It is plain that Mr. Eliot could not have learned the language if he had not been a well trained grammarian. He had a genius for acquiring languages, and he gradually gained the power not only to write the Indian language, but to speak it with fluency.

The first effort to preach to the Indians was made about the middle of September, 1646, not at Nonantum, but at Dorchester Mills. This was about fifteen years after Mr. Eliot came to this country. He says, "when I first attempted it they gave no heed unto it, but were weary and despised what I said." In another place he says, "the Indians at Dorchester Mills did not regard any such thing at first, though they afterwards desired to be taught to know God." [1]

The next effort was at Nonantum.[2] There had been great solicitude about the result of this second attempt, and much prayer had been offered. Mr. Eliot did not go alone, nor without an appointment. There were four in the missionary party: Eliot, and Thomas Shepard, minister in Cambridge, were certainly there. John Wilson, minister in Boston, and Major Gookin, probably were there. We have an account of the meeting, written by one who was present. It is plain from the narrative itself, that it could not have been written by Mr. Eliot.

"Upon October 28, 1646," so the record runs, "four of us, having sought God, went unto the Indians inhabiting within our bounds, with desire to make known the things of their peace to them. A little before we came to their wigwams, five or six of the chief of them met us with English salutations, bidding us much welcome; who, leading us into the

[1] *Collections Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3d series, vol. iv., 50. *Cockenöe*, p. 14. Eliot's letter to T. S. is dated Sept. 24, 1647.

[2] It is not easy to fix the exact location of Waban's wigwam, and so of Eliot's first preaching to the Indians. (See *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1st series, vol. i., 168.) The tradition, which runs back a number of generations, has fixed upon a spot on the southeastern slope of Nonantum Hill, in Newton, Mass. Here a terrace has been constructed, bearing an inscription, which states that "near this spot Eliot first preached to the Indians." See also Drake's *History of Middlesex County*, vol. ii., 443.

principall wigwam of Waauban, we found many more Indians, men, women, children gathered together from all quarters round about, according to appointment, to meet with us, and learn of us." [1]

When all were assembled "in that principall Wigwam of Waauban," Mr. Eliot began the service with prayer. He prayed in English, because his command of the language of the Indians was so imperfect that it seemed hardly reverent to address the Deity with such broken words. Then he preached to that attentive company for an hour and a quarter, "the blessed word of Salvation." He began by telling the Indians of the Law of God. He repeated the ten Commandments, one by one, and explained the meaning of each one of them. He had become familiar with the manner of life of the Indians, and he knew very well what their sins were, and so he explained to them in what ways they were breaking the commands of God every day of their lives. He told them that the great God was angry with them because they were breaking His commandments. He told them further, that he had come, with their English friends, to make known to them a Saviour, who had come into this world to seek and to save the lost, and that if they would repent of their sins, and pray to God for forgiveness, His anger would turn away from them, and He would love them as His dear children.[2]

Mr. Eliot then inquired whether they had understood what he had said. They answered that they had. He then said, "Have all of you in this Wigwam understood, or only some few; and they answered with multitude of voices, that they all of them did understand all that which was spoken to them." After this he invited them to ask questions, for the more clear understanding of what had been delivered. Whereupon one inquired, "How may we come to know Jesus Christ?" After this had been answered, another asked, "Whether Jesus Christ did understand, or God did under-

[1] *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections*, 3d series, vol. iv., p. 3, Day "Breaking of the Gospel in New England."

[2] *Ibid.*

stand Indian prayers, when they spoke in their own language?" They were told that God made Indians just as He made the English, and that He knew the words and even the thoughts of Indians because He had made them. "After a number of other inquiries had been answered by us, we also asked a number of them which they answered." "After three hours time thus spent with them, we asked them if they were not weary, and they answered, *No.* But Wee resolved to leave them with an appetite. The Chiefe of them seeing us conclude with prayer, desired to know when wee would come again: so wee appointed the time, and, having given the children some apples, and the men some tobacco, and what else we then had at hand . . . wee departed with many welcomes from them."[1]

Two weeks later, Mr. Eliot and his three friends came to Nonantum a second time, and found a larger number of Indians, and, what was very significant, that the Indians had provided seats for the English visitors. He began this time *with the children. He taught them the first three questions* in a short catechism which he was preparing for them in their own language.

"1. Who made you and all the world?
2. Who shall redeem you from sin and hell?
3. How many commandments hath God given you to keep?"

After the children had learned these questions Mr. Eliot preached to the Indians, "by the space of an hour," going over once more the principal facts and doctrines of the Christian religion. A number of Indians were melted to tears by what he told them of the love of God, and of their sin against Him. One old Indian inquired whether it "was too late for such an old man as hee, who was neare death to repent, or seek after God." Another asked "how the English came to differ so much from the Indians in the knowledge of God, seeing we all have one Father?" Another

[1] Winthrop, vol. ii., 304; *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3d series iv., 5–8.

wished to know "how we may come to serve God?" They spent the whole afternoon in this way. Mr. Eliot prayed this time in the Indian language, to the great joy and wonder of his dusky congregation.[1] They were now certain that the God whom the English worshipped could understand the prayers of the Indians.

Mr. Eliot continued to go to Nonantum once a fortnight to catechise the children,[2] and to preach to the people. He never went alone. He had the co-operation and support of the men of greatest influence in the Puritan Colony, both ministers and laymen. Governor Winthrop was sometimes there, and President Dunster of Harvard College, and Major Gookin, Edward Jackson, and Mr. Heath, and of the ministers, Richard Mather, Thomas Shepard, John Wilson, Mr. Allen of Dedham, and others. The work spread rapidly. An Indian Sachem at Neponset, Cuts-ha-ma-kim, who had at first opposed the work, desired to have Mr. Eliot come and preach in his wigwam. For some months Mr. Eliot went regularly once a fortnight to Neponset. Another Sachem who lived near Concord came to Nonantum to hear the missionary, and he also desired to have him go and preach to his people. In the course of a few months he had a number of preaching places in the Indian country, such as Pawtucket, where there was a great confluence of Indians every spring, Punkapaog, now Stoughton, and Nash-a-way, now Lancaster.

At the end of the first winter, Mr. Eliot wrote the following sentence in the record book of his church in Roxbury; —"This winter was one of the mildest that ever we had: no snow all winter long, nor sharp weather. We never had a bad day to go and preach to the Indians all this winter: praised be the Lord."

All the accounts that have come down to us indicate that there was a genuine religious work among the Indians at

[1] *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3d series, 8–17.

[2] Mr. Eliot extended his catechism for the children, so as to include the most important truths. This was afterwards printed, and was an important aid in teaching the Indian children. He also prepared and printed a larger Catechism for the Indians. *Coll. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, vol. i., p. 169.

that time. Among the results were such as these: The Indians forsook their former religion and worship; they began to pray not only by themselves but in their families, morning and evening, and to return thanks at their meals. They taught their children, as far as they were able, and they asked earnestly for teachers and schools. They began to keep the Lord's day, as a day of rest and of worship. They met by themselves, when the missionary could not be present, to pray, and to speak of the things they had learned from God's word.[1] Waban, the leading man at Nonantum, soon began to pray, and to teach his neighbors the things he had been taught. After the third meeting at Nonantum, there came to Mr. Eliot's house one Wampas, "a wise and sage Indian," with three Indian children, one of them his own son, desiring to put them under the care of the English that they might be educated to know God, for, said he, if they stay with us they will grow up in rudeness and in wickedness. He also brought two young men who wished to find employment in English families, that they might be taught the true religion in which they already felt a deep interest.

Mr. Eliot believed that civilization must go with Christianity. "I find it absolutely necessary," he says, "to carry on civility with religion."[2] The savage must form habits of regular industry, before he can have strength of character to live an honest and virtuous life. He believed that "cleanliness is next to Godliness." He pointed out that there could be no delicacy in the family life so long as all lived by day and by night in one apartment. So he desired to gather the families of praying Indians into a community where they could build better houses, and could labor in the fields as the English did. The General Court "purchased land for them to make a towne," at Nonantum, at the same time that the Indians were consulting about laws to govern their community. Under the lead of Waban they adopted ten laws, because there were ten commandments, and they did not

[1] *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 3d series, iv., 51. Letter of Eliot to T. S.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 88.

think they needed any more. These laws were intended to secure habits of industry, and of virtue, and to lead to a cleanly and decent way of living. The Indians set about fencing the ground that had been given them, some hundreds of acres, and improving it. Mr. Eliot provided them with "shovels, mattocks, and crowes of iron," and he engaged to give them sixpence a rod for all the stone wall they would build. The Indians desired to know what name their town should have, and they were told it should be called Noönatomen, or Nonantum, which signifies rejoicing. They set about building houses with partitions, for separate rooms, so that, we are told, the meanest of them were equal to those of any Sachem. Their English friends provided them with cloth, which the Indians made into garments, so that in a little time they were able to go to the religious services decently clothed. It was a great uplift for those poor people. Mr. Eliot promised to furnish them trees for orchards. The women desired to learn to spin, and he obtained wheels for them and so they began to live industrious lives. They soon had something to sell in the market at all seasons of the year. Mr. Shepard states that when he came to Nonantum, "late in the summer of 1647 he marvailed to see so many Indian men, women and children, in English apparell, they being generally clad, especially upon Lecture days, which they have got partly by gift from the English, and partly by their own labours, by which some of them have very handsomely appareled themselves, and you would scarce know them from English people."[1]

On the 9th of June, 1647, the Cambridge Synod met for its second session at Cambridge. It was thought best that the work among the Indians should be brought before the representatives of all the churches of New England. So Mr. Eliot called together the praying Indians and preached to them in their own language in the presence of the Synod. He set before them, as he always did, the teachings of the Bible in respect to sin, and in respect to the Saviour who

[1] *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 3d series, vol. iv., pp. 44–59. Eliot's letters in the same.

has been provided. He catechised the children also, and the ministers were pleased not only by the careful attention which the people gave to the word, but also "by the readiness of divers poor naked children to answer openly the chief questions which had been taught them."[1] From that time the work among the Indians had a large place in the sympathies and the prayers of good people not only here but in England.

Thus, in less than a year, the work among the Indians had reached a point where it was necessary to ask for regular and generous contributions for carrying it forward, and those contributions must come from beyond the sea. The settlements in New England were still very new, and the people were poor. Boston was only seventeen years old, and the time of log cabins and thatched roofs had not gone by. The towns south of Boston were infested by wolves. Dorchester was paying a bounty of thirty shillings for every wolf's head. That part of Roxbury that is now Walnut Avenue was then called the Fox-holes, and a little further on toward Grove Hall were the Bear Marsh, and the Wolf-traps.[2]

There was not a Protestant Missionary Society in the world at that time.[3] Mr. Eliot and his co-laborers set themselves to create such a society in England. Very careful and definite accounts of the work among the Indians were written and published in England, such as *The Day Breaking; The Glorious Progress of the Gospel;* and *The Clear Sunshine.* Governor Edward Winslow, the agent of the Colonies in England, published in London a number of the letters of Mr. Eliot, in which, in the most simple and natural way he told of what God was doing for the Indians. The statements of religious experience which the praying Indians made before the ministers were taken down in writing, and published and read in England. "We need some annual revenue," said

[1] Winthrop, vol. ii., 376. *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 3d series, vol. iv., 45.

[2] *Protestant Missions*, Dr. A. C. Thompson, 56–8.

[3] *Ibid.*, 57.

Mr. Eliot in one of his letters to England, "to purchase tools for the Indians, to pay teachers for their schools, to pay for printing in their language a primer in which they may learn to read, and to pay for such help as I need in translating the Scriptures, which I look upon as a sacred and holy work. We shall also need to pay for printing such a translation when it shall have been made. Besides, there be sundry pregnant-witted youths, which I desire may be wholly sequestered to learning, and put to schoole." [1]

Such appeals to English Christians were not in vain. Oliver Cromwell, then Lord Protector, is said to have had a plan for the universal diffusion of Christianity, and his influence was in favor of every Protestant Missionary enterprise. A corporation was established by act of Parliament, entitled: The President and Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. It was ordered that a general contribution for the object should be made in all the churches in England and Wales. The amount that was sent to New England in those years by this society cannot be stated in definite terms, but it certainly amounted to several thousand pounds. The charter was renewed in 1660, after the restoration of Charles II., and Sir Robert Boyle, one of the founders of the Royal Society, was its President.[2]

The funds received from this Society were used in paying the expenses of the education of a number of young Indians, who became preachers to their people; in building the Indian College at Cambridge; in printing Eliot's Indian Bible, and other books in the Indian language, in providing tools and instruments of various kinds for their use; and in paying salaries to missionaries, and native preachers and teachers. The way was thus prepared for securing the pecuniary support of this Indian work in New England, and this society was the pioneer of a great number of Foreign Missionary Societies, which have been supported by English and American Christians.[3]

[1] *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 3d series, vol. iv., 123. Eliot's Letter.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1st series, vol. i., 218; vol. iii., 180, Letter iii., also Letter vii. Francis' *Life of Eliot*, 228–30.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1st series, vol. i., 212.

The time had now come to carry out Mr. Eliot's plans for a larger and more permanent settlement for the Christian Indians. Nonantum was found to be too small, and too near the English towns. The missionary work was making rapid progress among the Massachusetts tribe of Indians, and it was expected that it would extend to the more numerous and powerful tribes, the Narragansetts, and the Mohegans, and to other branches of the great Algonquin family in New England. The missionaries in the Colony of Plymouth were also encouraged by their success among the Pokanokets, or Wampanoags, to expect the conversion of the Narragansetts. The plans of Mr. Eliot were made in the expectation of bringing the entire Indian race under the influence of the gospel. In November, 1648, he wrote to Governor Winslow in London: "The Indians are not willing to come to live near to the English, because they have neither tools, nor skill, nor heart to fence their grounds, and if it be not well fenced their Corne is spoyled by the English cattle, which is a great discouragement to them and to me. A place must be found somewhere remote from the English, where they must have the word constantly taught, and government constantly exercised." There should be "incouragements for the industrious, and means of instructing them in letters, trades, and labours, as building, fishing, Flax and Hemp dressing, planting orchards, etc. Such a fit place will draw many from divers places who desire to be taught the knowledge of God."[1]

These were the plans of Mr. Eliot for an Indian town. The matter was under consideration two or three years. He made a number of excursions into the wilderness in the hope of finding the right place. This matter was made the subject of prayer, by the friends of the work among the English, as well as among the Indians. At length a place was selected, on the banks of Charles River, eighteen miles southwest from Boston. They called it Natick, "a place of Hills." It was granted to the praying Indians by the people of Dedham, at the request of Mr. Eliot. This grant was confirmed by

[1] *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections*, 3d series, vol. iv., 81.

the General Court. It is also recorded, at Natick, that two families which were supposed to have some claim upon this land, gave a quit claim of all their right and interest in the land in Natick "unto the publick interest of the Towne of Naticke, that so the praying Indians might there make a Towne."[1]

When the land had been secured, Mr. Eliot induced a considerable number of the praying Indians to remove from Nonantum, and from some other villages, to Natick. The settlement was begun in the spring of 1651. The town was laid out in three streets, two on the Boston side of Charles River, and one on the other side. A foot-bridge had been built across the river, the year before, by the Indians, under the direction of Mr. Eliot. This bridge was eighty feet long, and nine feet above the water in the middle, with a strong foundation of stone. This bridge is said to have answered its purpose well, and to have stood against the floods longer than some of those built by the English.[2]

Lots of land were measured and divided. A house-lot was assigned to each family. The fields were sown for a crop, apple-trees were planted and dwellings were erected. The Indians at first built wigwams, "because," as Mr. Gookin says, "they had more skill in such building, and because wigwams were less costly, and warmer."[3] In the course of time, however, the Indians built houses like those of the English colonists, with partitions, and with cellars underneath. They also built a fort, of the trunks of trees set in the ground, in circular form. This stockade covered a quarter of an acre of ground. They also built, with a little assistance from an English carpenter, a large framed house, fifty feet long, and twenty-five feet wide, twelve feet between the floors. This building was for the common use. The lower part was a place for worship on the Lord's day. On other days it was used for a school room. The second floor was a store-house for furs and other goods. One corner of this storeroom was

[1] Bigelow's *History of Natick*, Boston 1830, 23.
[2] *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections*, 3d series, iv., 138 and 178.
[3] *Ibid.*, 1st series, vol. i., 181.

separated from the rest by a partition, for the use of Mr. Eliot. Here he had a bed, which he occupied as often as he had occasion to remain over night. Governor Endicott praised the ingenuity and the industry of the Indians, "in hewing and squaring their timber, the sawing of the boards, and making a chimney, making also the ground-sells, and wall-plates, mortising, and letting in the studs into them, there being but one Englishman to show them, and he only two days." [1]

The next business was the organization of the Indian Community. Mr. Eliot induced them to accept the plan of government which he had recommended in his book, *The Christian Commonwealth;* a plan which he had borrowed from the eighteenth chapter of Exodus. The people elected their own rulers. They chose first a ruler of a hundred; then two rulers of fifties; and then rulers of tens, whom they called tithing men. They also entered into a compact or covenant. It was written by Mr. Eliot, and the record of it is probably the earliest public record in existence in the language of the Massachusetts Indians. It is dated September 24, 1651, and is in these words:

"We doe give ourselves and our children unto God, to be his people. He shall rule us in all our affairs, not only in our religion and affairs of the church, (these we desire as soon as we can, if God will,) but also in all our works and affairs of this world, God shall rule over us. The Lord is our Judge. The Lord is our Law-giver. The Lord is our King. He will save us. The wisdome which God hath taught us in his Booke, that shall guide us and direct us in the way. O, Jehovah, teach us wisdom to find out thy wisdome in thy Scriptures. Let the grace of Christ help us, because Christ is the wisdome of God. Send thy Spirit into our hearts, and let it teach us. Lord take us to be thy people, and let us take thee to be our God." [2]

Two weeks later, Governor Endicott, Mr. Wilson, and many others attended the religious services at Natick, and

[1] *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 3d series, iv., 190; also 1st series, i., 181.

[2] *Ibid.*, 3d series, vol. iv., 172.

they have left an account of what they saw. The Governor was much pleased by the exhortations and prayers of the Indians, and by the attention and seriousness of the congregation, which numbered about one hundred; and especially by the singing of a psalm by the Indians in their own language. Mr. Wilson described the appearance of the village, the circular stockade, the framed common house, the dwellings of the people, "the firme high footbridge over the River, archwise." He spoke of the appearance of the assembly, the men seated by themselves, and the women by themselves; of the sermon of Mr. Eliot, for an hour more, about "coming to Christ, and bearing His yoke." They found the Indian School then in progress, and many other agencies that belonged to this missionary settlement.

The laws of the Colony of Massachusetts were extended over this Indian town, with certain limitations. The Indians were left free to manage their local affairs in their own way. The chief of their officers was Waban, who was a man of great discretion as well as piety. He was the natural leader of the settlement. Two constables were chosen each year. The General Court appointed Major Gookin to superintend the various Indian reservations. He was empowered to hold a court, of which he was to be the presiding judge, and of which certain officers chosen by the Indians were to be members. The powers of this court were such as county courts among the English exercised.[1]

Natick was the model for a number of other Indian Communities which were organized within the next thirty years, by Mr. Eliot. There seems to have been in these Cummunities a combination of the private ownership of houses and house-lots, with the tribal ownership and use of those buildings and lands that belonged to the Community. Major Gookin, while he was the Indian commissioner, made visits to all the towns of praying Indians, in company with Mr. Eliot. He has left an interesting account of three such visits made in 1673 and 1674, which contains the only definite information of the Indian Communities that has come down to us. He found fourteen of these communities.

[1] *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1st series, i., 177–184.

Each of the older communities had its Indian reservation, consisting of from two thousand to six or seven thousand acres of land. Each had its place of worship, its school and its teacher. Mr. Eliot had trained a number of young Indians as preachers for these congregations, and he went, from time to time, to the people to introduce preachers, who were accepted by them with great joy. They were in the habit of observing the Lord's day, and of meeting for worship and religious instruction on that day. The Indians to whom Mr. Eliot had preached at Neponset had removed to Pakemitt, within the limits of Stoughton. They had a ruler, a constable, and a schoolmaster. Mr. John Eliot, Jr., preached to them once a fortnight for a number of years, until his decease. Pawtucket, on the Merrimac, where Mr. Eliot began to preach very early, had a community of about seventy-five praying Indians. Their teacher was Samuel, who had been educated at the expense of the English Society. Once a year there was a great gathering of Indians from a large extent of country to fish at the falls of the Merrimac. This was the time when Mr. Eliot was able to reach a large number of strangers. Other communities were in the vicinity of Concord, of Marlborough, Grafton, Uxbridge, Woodstock, Lancaster, Worcester, and Brookfield. Mr. Gookin found about eleven hundred Christian people in these fourteen towns, in 1674. Many of them had been baptised, and a much smaller number had been gathered into churches.[1]

[1] *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections*, 1st series, vol. i., 180–195. The following are the names of the towns mentioned by Mr. Gookin:

Naticke,	6000 acres,	29 families,	145 persons.
Pakemitt, or Punkapaog,	6000 "	12 "	60 "
Hassanamessitt,	8000 "	12 "	60 "
Okommakamesit,	6000 "	10 "	50 "
Wamesit or Pawtuckett,	2500 "	15 "	75 "
Nashobah,	2600 "	10 "	50 "
Magunkaquog,	3000 "	11 "	55 "
Manchage,	unknown	12 "	60 "
Chabanakongkomun,	"	9 "	45 "
Maannexit,	"	20 "	100 "
Quantisset,	"	20 "	100 "
Wabquisset,	"	30 "	150 "
Pakachoog,	"	20 "	100 "
Waeuntug,	"	10 "	50 "

In connection with these communities I should speak of the earliest Indian churches. Mr. Eliot desired to gather the Christian Indians into churches as soon as they were prepared for church membership. This wish was shared by a large number of the praying Indians. But Mr. Eliot was a cautious man, though bold and decided when he was sure that the time for action had come. There were reasons for special care in this matter. The Indians, although sincere in their professions, were easily led astray by those who lived by pandering to their weaknesses. Although it was contrary to the laws of the Colony to sell strong drink to them, the laws were constantly violated, and the work of the missionary was hindered by the lapses of his people into intemperance. After the Indians had orchards of their own, and fields of grain, they learned to distil strong liquors for themselves. Intemperance was sure to lead these weak people into other forms of evil. The consequence was that some, who had run well for a time, became apostates, and went back to the vices of the pagans.

It appears from a number of circumstances that public opinion in the Colony was never quite favorable to the formation of Indian churches, because the majority of the people did not trust the Indians. There were many who believed that it was enough to gather them into communities like the one at Natick, where they could have regular instruction from their ministers, without organizing them into churches. Mr. Eliot did trust the Indians, because he knew them so well, but he accepted the Puritan doctrine of a converted church membership, and he did not think it would be wise to admit them to full communion in the churches until they had been sufficiently proved.

So he acted with great caution. He taught the praying Indians very carefully the larger Catechism which he had prepared. For a number of years he had a class of catechumens at Natick which he met regularly, and to which he gave a great deal of time. In August, 1652, he called together the pastors of the churches to hear the statements which the Indians might make of "their experience in the Lord's work upon their hearts." Two years later the Indians were called

a second time before a council of ministers to give a reason for the hope that was in them. The questions and answers are in print, and they show the care that was used to test the Indians as to their knowledge of religious truth, and as to the sincerity of their religious professions. They showed that they had made great progress in the knowledge of the Bible, and in spiritual discernment. But it was not until 1660 that the first church among the praying Indians was formed at Natick. Mr. Eliot baptised the catechumens, and administered to them the Lord's supper. From that time the church at Natick was recognized as a regular Congregational church, with its own officers, and its regular worship and the Christian sacraments. It is not known how many members it had in the beginning, but in 1670 it had between forty and fifty communicants. In 1671 the second Indian church was gathered at Hassa-na-messett, within the present town of Grafton. This church had a "meeting house for the worship of God after the English fashion of building." It had a native pastor, and a ruling elder, and a deacon. There were sixteen members of the church living in the town, and several others living in other places. There were in the community about thirty baptised persons.[1] A few other Indian churches were organized, but the number was never large. A considerable number of Indians were members of the English churches in the colony. Some of them preferred to be admitted to such churches, and they were welcomed.

In the training of Indian preachers, Mr. Eliot was very successful. It was his opinion that native Indians were better fitted to preach to their own people than others can be. He lived to see twenty-four such preachers raised up, and prepared for their work, many of them by his own instrumentality. We have the authority of Dr. A. C. Thompson for the statement that after all that has been done for Indian missions during the present century, it is not certain that there are as many well qualified Indian preachers today, as there were two centuries ago.[2]

[1] *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1st series, vol. i., 184-185.

[2] *Protestant Missions*, 71.

In addition to the care of these settlements of praying Indians, Mr. Eliot was engaged for almost forty years in preparing to translate the Bible into the language of the Massachusetts Indians, and in the translation itself. This was his greatest work. He held the opinion that the people could not become intelligent and stable Christians until they had the Sacred Scriptures in their own language, and were able to read them. For years after he was able to speak the language himself, and to teach the Indians to read it, he did not venture to hope that he could put the Bible, in printed form, into their language. But when he found that it was possible for him to do it, he accepted it as the crowning work of his life. The language was at best that of a barbarous people, a language, we are told, without poetry or songs. To put the great mass of inspired thought, which had come to him in the forms of Hebrew and Greek speech, into a language so barren of words to express spiritual truth was a most difficult task. The word book, for example, did not exist in the Indian speech, for they had no books. So he must borrow the word from another language. They had no word for testament, or for Christ, and no fit word to be used as the name of God; and so all these English words were transferred in order to make *the title-page for the Indian Bible.* Even the word salt had to be put into the language, and with that, a great many other words to stand for things that are common-places among civilized people, but are strange to people without culture.

Our present Revised Version of the Bible was the work of almost one hundred of the selected scholars of England and America. But it was only a revision of an English Version that was itself the work of many hands, two centuries and a half earlier. Almost every one of the great translations of the Bible has been made by the help of a large number of men trained to scholarly investigation. But Eliot had no companions in his work except such Indian interpreters as he had first taught to read and to write. But he labored at his desk, early and late, year after year, amid the calls for preaching, and parochial work among his own people; the calls for preaching, and teaching, and training preachers and

teachers for his Indian congregations; the care of his family; the care also of that Society in England from which all his funds must come; and the care of those communities of praying Indians. How wonderful that the translation got itself done at last. It is by the confession of all among the wonders of literary history.

The translation of the New Testament was published in Cambridge in September, 1661, about thirty years after Mr. Eliot landed in New England, and fifteen years after he began preaching to the Indians. That of the Old Testament was published in 1663. The printers, and the printing-press, the types and all the materials necessary for the printing, were sent over from England, by the Society for Propagating the Gospel in New England, which society paid the expenses of the publication. The number of copies in the first edition was probably fifteen hundred.[1] The expense was not far from £1000. It was the first Bible printed in America. It was not till the middle of the next century that the Bible in English was printed in this country. This edition lasted about twenty years. A large number of the younger Indians were able to read it. It was the household book in hundreds of cabins in the wilderness. It was the most effective means which the missionary was able to employ in his work.

In 1680, a second edition of the New Testament was printed, and five years later, the second edition of the Old Testament was also printed. Mr. Eliot was assisted in the revision by Rev. John Cotton, Jr., of Plymouth, who had acquired a good knowledge of the language. Mr. Eliot was eager to have the revision completed. "My age," he says, "makes me importunate. I shall depart joyfully may I but leave the Bible among them; for it is the word of life." "I desire to see it done before I die, and I am so deep in years, that I cannot expect to live long."

But the two testaments were bound up together; and the Psalms in Indian metre, with a Catechism, were added; and this second edition of two thousand copies was in use three

[1] Francis, *Life*, 225.

or four years before the death of the translator. The cost of this edition was £1000. It is interesting to learn that one of the printers was an Indian. These two editions made about thirty-five hundred copies in the language of this tribe. It was the most precious book in many Indian homes. It served to keep alive the piety of the Indians in the dark days that were before them.[1]

It is a rare and curious book now, the only monument of a language that has passed away with the people who used it. A very small number of persons now living can read it. It is the most valuable means for studying the dialects of the Algonquin tongue. More than one hundred copies remain, in libraries in this country and in Europe. It commands a higher price, at auction sales, than almost any other book. One word, at least, has been adopted into our language from Eliot's Bible. The great leaders among the Israelites, like Joshua, and Gideon, and Samson, were called in that Bible, Mug-Wumps, and this is a good name for the independent leaders and voters among our citizens.

While Mr. Eliot was securing the formation of a Missionary Society in England, for the support of Indian missions, and in gathering the praying Indians into communities and churches, and translating the Bible into their language, he was laying a broad foundation for permanent work among them. He confidently expected that the race would become a civilized and a Christian people. Some of the "wise and sage" Indians were accustomed to say at that time, that within fifty or a hundred years all the Indians would become like the English. The exceptionally rapid progress of the missionary work, during the first thirty years, under the Mayhews and others on the Islands and in the Plymouth Colony, and under Eliot in Massachusetts, made this seem very probable. The "great hope and inward zeall" of the Pilgrims and the Puritans, led them to labor and pray very earnestly that it might be accomplished.

[1] The Indian title of the second edition of the Bible is this: *Mamusse Wunneetupanatamwe, Up-Biblum God Nanesswe Nukone Testament kah wonk Wusku Testament.*

Mr. Eliot made efforts from year to year to obtain a hearing for the gospel among the Mohegans, and the Narragansetts, those more powerful tribes, of whom the Massachusetts and the Pakonoket tribes were afraid. He petitioned the Commissioners of the Colonies to provide for the "instruction of all the Indians in all parts," and he told the Indians that he had done so. "The Mohegans," he says, "were much troubled lest the Court of Commissioners should take some course to teach them to pray to God," and their Sachem went to Hartford to express "his great unwillingness thereunto."[1]

This opposition of the Sachems to missionary work among their people was very decided. Mr. Eliot tells us that one of them came to his religious services, and after the Lecture, he protested against his "proceeding to make a Town," and told him all the Sachems in the country were against it. He was so violent that all the Indians "were filled with fear, their countenances grew pale, and most of them slunk away." But Mr. Eliot replied to him with equal boldness: "*I told him*," he says, "*that it was God's work I was about, and that God was with me.*" "'I do not fear you,' I said, 'nor all the sachems in the country. I am resolved to go on with my work, and do you touch me if you dare.'" "And it pleased God," we read in Mr. Eliot's record, "that his spirit shrank, and fell before me." So it was that this humble man of God, "whose heart was full of love, and who with the most winning gentleness would interest himself in the wants of the little children of the wigwam," was able, when the occasion demanded, to face without dismay the savage chiefs, and answer their violence with a firmness, before which the stoutest of them quailed.

Still, the missionary was often in great personal danger, for the Sachems and the powwows, or medicine men, believed that they should lose their power over the people if the religion of the English should make progress among them. The Sachems would sometimes drive him out with violence, and would tell him that if he came again it would be at his

[1] *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 3d series, vol. iv., 139.

peril. Still he continued his work, and planned as wisely as he was able for its extension. He sent two discreet Indians at one time, with a generous present to the most powerful Sachem among the Narragansetts, with the purpose of teaching his people the Bible. The Sachem accepted the present, but refused to receive religious instruction. But the young Indians went about among the people, and found them willing and eager to receive what they had to tell them of the Gospel. He was continually sending his trained native helpers, on missions among the pagan Indians, and they found the way open to do good among the people, though they seldom had any favor from the chiefs.

There is a story mentioned by a number of the earlier biographers, that Mr. Eliot once met King Philip himself, and urged him to accept the Christian faith, and to encourage the teaching of the Bible among his people. It is said that the chieftain rose to his feet, and taking hold of a button on Mr. Eliot's coat, said, with vehemence, "*I care no more for your gospel than I care for that button.*" This story, if true, shows, some of the causes of King Philip's war.

Mr. Eliot pushed his work forward wherever he was permitted. During the twenty-five years from 1650 to 1675 he was enlarging the circle of his influence every year. He made Natick the centre of his operations, but he went himself to a great number of Indian villages, some of them far away. Sometimes it was necessary for him to send Indians over the path to mark the trees; or to cut a path for the missionary through the thick woods.[1] He went four times in one year to Nashaway, now Lancaster, though it was forty miles away. He went generally by invitation. The aged Sachem at Quaboag (now Brookfield), sixty miles away, asked him to come and teach him and his people. But there had been hostilities between the Narragansetts and the Mohegans, and the road was unsafe. So the Sachem at Nashaway came, with twenty armed men, to escort the missionary. He took some of his English friends also, as an

[1] *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 3d series, vol. iv., 123.

additional guard. But the journey proved to be a hard one. There was continual rain, and they had no protection from the storm by night or by day. "I was not dry, night nor day," he says, "from the third day of the week unto the sixth, but so travelled, and at night pull off my boots, wring my stockins, and on with them again, and so continued." "The rivers also were raised, so that we were wet in riding through. But that which added to my affliction was, my horse tyred, so that I was forced to let my horse go empty, and ride on one of the men's horses, which I took along with me. Yet God helped me. I considered that word of God: 'Endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.'"[1] At the end of the journey, the missionary found "sundry who were hungry after instruction," so that he was well paid for his journey. He records with thankfulness, that neither himself, nor any of his company was hurt, but came home in safety and in health.

I do not know where to look for more interesting journals of missionary work than we have in Major Gookin's narrative of an official tour which he took with Mr. Eliot through the country of praying Indians the year before the great war. They went on horseback, through the forests, Major Gookin as the Magistrate, and Mr. Eliot as the Apostle to the Indians, both acting under the authority of the General Court. The law and the gospel—civilization and religion—went together. Setting out from Natick, they visited Stoughton, and Pawtuckett, and Littleton, Hopkinton, Lancaster, Dudley, Uxbridge, Woodstock, and Brookfield. Eliot spent the days in journeying, and in preaching. In the evenings he met his old friends in their wigwams, and heard and answered their questions, talked with the little children, comforted the sick and the afflicted, and led them all to a closer fellowship with the Master.

The good work among the Indians continued to advance up to the beginning of King Philip's war, in 1675. There were at that time about eleven hundred praying Indians on the mainland in Massachusetts, who were distributed in four-

[1] *Collections of Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3d series, vol. iv., 125.

teen towns, seven of which had tracts of land secured to them by the General Court. Schools for the children of Indians had been in operation in most of these towns for many years, and a large proportion of the younger Indians were able to read, and a smaller proportion were able to write. The preachers and the teachers in these villages were nearly all Indians. There were two organized churches within this field, with not quite one hundred members.

Outside the field of Mr. Eliot's direct labors a more extended missionary work had been carried on within the old Colony, and on the Islands, and in Rhode Island, and Connecticut. This work probably began a little earlier than that on the mainland in the Massachusets Colony.[1] It was prosecuted by a number of enterprising and devoted missionaries, among whom were the Mayhews, father, son, and grandson, Richard Bourne, Thomas Tupper, John Cotton, Jr., and Samuel Treat, and in Rhode Island and Connecticut, Roger Williams, Abraham Pierson, and James Fitch. Some of these missionaries were in charge of English churches, others gave their whole time to the work among the Indians.[2] In 1675, there were about twenty-five hundred praying Indians in the Old Colony, and on the Islands. Mr. Eliot states that there were four churches on the same ground at that time.[3] Many of these Indians had been civilized, and gathered into towns, which towns had tracts of land, larger or smaller, secured to the Indians by the Government of the Colony. Most of the Indian congregations had native pastors. A large number of the people were able to read and write their own language.

These missionaries received salaries from the Society in England. Mr. Eliot had £50 a year, Mr. Mayhew £30, and Mr. Bourne £25. There was a constant interchange of fraternal greetings, and of labors. Mr. Mayhew assisted at the

[1] *Collections Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3d series, vol. iv., 109. *England Memorial*, 379–384.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1st series, vol. i., 196–210; 3d series, vol. iv., 107–118. *New England Memorial*, 379–400.

[3] *Ibid.* Also Francis, *Life of Eliot*, 263–5.

organization of the church at Natick, and Mr. Eliot assisted at the organization of the church at Mashpee, and at the ordination of a number of pastors.

An interesting incident has been preserved, which shows the liberal spirit of Mr. Eliot, in connection with the account of the visit to Boston of Father Gabriel Druillette, a Jesuit missionary from Canada, in 1650. During his stay in Massachusetts, he called at the house of Mr. Eliot in Roxbury. He writes in his journal that Eliot invited him to lodge with him, as the night had overtaken him. These two missionaries—the Jesuit and the Puritan—had much discourse concerning their work among the Indians. "Here is a scene," says Dr. Ellis, "that might well engage the pencil of an artist. These two men, . . . separated as the poles in their religious convictions, principles, and methods, are seen in simple, human, loving converse, as kind host, and responsive stranger guest. The humble sitting and working room of the Apostle Eliot, in his modest cottage, has the essentials of comfort, and there is a guest chamber." The Priest writes in his journal that Eliot treated him with respect and affection, and invited him to pass the winter with him. The morning and evening devotions of the Puritan household, with grace and blessing each meal, must have kept their wonted course, while the faithful Priest had his oratory,—his orisons,—and his matin Mass before breaking his fast. So nearly do good people of different creeds approach each other, who are devoted to the service of the one Lord, and to the salvation of their fellow-men.

If peaceful relations could have been continued between the Colonists and the Aborigines, it is probable that these efforts to civilize and christianize the Indians would have been so far successful that the great body of them would have adopted the manner of life and the religion of the English settlers. That, as we have seen, was the expectation of some of the more enlightened Indians.

Still, the method of separating the Christian Indians from their countrymen, may not have been so wise as it seemed to Mr. Eliot. It is not the method of modern missionaries.

The love of independence, however, was a strong sentiment among the savages. The settlements of the English were crowding upon their hunting grounds, and the leaders among the more powerful tribes, especially the Mohegans and the Narragansetts, believed that they should become a subject race if they permitted civilization and Christianity to change the habits of their people. These pagan chiefs had a powerful leader in King Philip, the son of Massasoit, chief Sachem of the Wampanoags. In him the highest spirit of his race was impersonated, and he led the pagan Indians in a desperate war, in which their watchword was victory or death. The war covered all New England. For almost three years there was a reign of terror. All the New England Colonies united their forces. From the beginning, the war was cruel and desperate. The burning of Lancaster, and Medfield, and Brookfield, and Deerfield, and Groton, and Warwick, and Providence, and Marlborough; the massacre of helpless women and children,—the scalping of husbands and brothers, the infernal torture of prisoners,—roused the whole of New England to a vigorous, and, in the end, a successful war.

But the war swept away the largest number of the praying Indians, in that part of Massachusetts which was the field of Eliot's labors. Their towns were in that part of the Colony where the contest raged most fiercely. They were not trusted by either party. Philip suspected them all, because they had already yielded themselves to the laws and the religion of the Colonists. The English did not trust them, because they believed that with the Indians, the ties of blood would be stronger than the obligations to their new friends. This distrust was strengthened by the fact that some of the praying Indians, from the newer towns, were induced to fight with Philip on the side of their race. At the same time, the great body of the Christian Indians was entirely loyal to the English. Several hundreds of them enlisted in the army, and taught the English how to cope with the tactics which the Indians always follow. Many times the army was saved from a treacherous ambush by the skill of these allies. "I contend," says Major Gookin, "that the small

company of our Indian friends, have taken and slain of the enemy, in the summer of 1676, not less than four hundred, and their fidelity and courage are testified by the certificates of their captains."

And yet amid the excitements of the time the friendly Indians were suspected. The slightest occurrence was enough to kindle the passions of the people. A barn was burned. It was afterwards discovered that it was set on fire by the hostile Indians. But the inhabitants at once imputed the crime to the Christian Indians, and a number of them were shot before their own doors. Mr. Eliot, now more than seventy years of age, defended the Indians when they were unjustly accused. In some instances Mr. Gookin and Mr. Eliot proved before a court of justice that the charges against the Indians were unjust, and secured their release. This made them unpopular with the people, who accused them of being in sympathy with robbers and murderers.

In October, 1675, the General Court passed an order that the Indians at Natick should be forthwith removed to Deer Island for safe-keeping. There were at that time some two hundred of them, and their removal would break up the settlement, which had been their home for twenty-four years. No charge was made against them, except that it was feared that they might become traitors. They sadly but quietly submitted. Their venerable missionary met them on the banks of Charles River, and exhorted them to submit patiently, and to remember that "through much tribulation they must enter into the Kingdom of God." All who witnessed the scene were deeply affected by the quiet resignation "of the poor souls, encouraging and exhorting one another with prayers and tears." Later the Christian Indians of Punkapog and of a number of other places were also removed to Deer Island and Long Island, so that the whole number in captivity was more than five hundred. They were exposed to much suffering, from the lack of food and proper care, and many of them died during their confinement. Eliot and Gookin, and other friends visited them frequently, encouraging them, and ministering to their wants.

When the stress of the war was past, the Indians were removed to Cambridge. Many of them were very ill at the time of their removal. Mr. Eliot and Major Gookin devoted themselves to them, securing for them wholesome food, and such care and medicine as their condition required, so that the most of them recovered. Before winter they removed from Cambridge. Most of them returned to Natick and the other settlements from which they had been taken. But they had suffered great losses by the breaking up of their homes. A large number had lost their lives during the war. The survivors came back in poverty, with diminished numbers, without heart or hope. The sympathy and confidence which they had begun to cherish toward their white neighbors had received a rude shock. They felt that, in any emergency, they were powerless, and that they had no means of securing redress. All these things tended to limit the progress of the missionary work which had been so auspiciously commenced.

Mr. Eliot resumed his regular missionary labors as soon as the war was over. He endeavored to gather such as remained of the Indians into their old villages and places of worship. He was busy preaching to his own people, and visiting the Indians at their homes, and encouraging schools. His latest years were busy years.

It is easy to understand why his work for the Indians did not secure larger and more permanent results. He laid, as we have seen, a good foundation for a great missionary enterprise. Under favorable circumstances, the churches which were gathered by Eliot, and the Mayhews, and their associates, would have grown to such numbers and influence that they would have evangelized the entire race of Indians. But those churches were planted among a small and decaying people. Mr. Bancroft estimates the whole number of Indians in New England, west of the St. Croix, in 1675, at thirty thousand; a number less than the population of a small city. About four thousand of this small number, more than one eighth, had already been evangelized. The Indian population had been declining for some years before Europeans came to settle on these coasts. It continued to

decline. King Philip's war was fatal to the Indian race in these Eastern colonies. The tribes were broken up and scattered among the other tribes, so that the Indians no longer appear as an important element of population here. Everything was done that could be done to preserve and enlarge the Indian churches. In 1684 Mr. Eliot wrote that the number of villages of praying Indians had been reduced to four, viz.: Natick, Pawtucket, Stoughton, and Dudley. In the Old Colony and on the Islands the number was considerably larger. There was some religious growth in these communities. The native preachers were earnest and diligent in their work. They were assisted by the English ministers, who had planted the churches, and by their successors. But the Indian race faded away, year by year, and the churches of necessity became smaller and weaker. The reason was not that the English crowded them out. They had set apart reservations of land which were secured to the Indians; and they taught them how to cultivate the land. The Indian lacked iron in the blood; strength of purpose; power to resist temptation to intemperance and to other vices. Even Christianity, as it was set forth by Eliot and Mayhew and the other apostles to the Indians, could not secure the continued existence of the race. "There is a cloud," said Mr. Eliot in his old age, "a dark cloud upon the work of the Gospel among the poor Indians. The Lord revive and prosper that work, and grant that it may live when I am dead."

Mr. Eliot had a serene and beautiful old age. His mind was vigorous and active. At the age of seventy-four he published *The Harmony of the Gospels*, a work to which he had devoted a great deal of study. He wrote frequently to England in regard to the printing of his revised version of the Bible. "Our praying Indians," he said, "both on the islands and on the mainland, include thousands of souls, and all of them beg, cry and entreat for Bibles." He carried the revised edition of the Indian Bible through the press when he had passed his eightieth year. He was interested in the progress of medical science, and in the study of theology. He continued to preach as long as his strength

lasted, and then he asked his people to make no delay in selecting his successor. He outlived nearly all his old friends in the ministry, and he used to say that Richard Mather and John Cotton and the other dear friends who were waiting for him in Heaven would think he had gone the wrong way. His last words were, "Welcome joy." He died on the 20th of May, 1690, eighty-six years of age, one of the last of that generation of great and holy men.

He was buried in the parish tomb, in the old burying ground at the corner of Washington and Eustis Streets, Boston.[1]

Mrs. Eliot had died three years before, March 24, 1687.

Their children were:

Hannah, born September 17, 1633.
John, born August 3, 1636, H. C., 1656.
Joseph, born December 20, 1638, H. C., 1658.
Samuel, born June 22, 1641, H. C., 1660.
Aaron, born February 19, 1644, died 1655.
Benjamin, born January 29, 1647, H. C., 1665.

The following is a partial list of his publications, in addition to the Indian Bible:

An Indian Catechism, 1655.
The Christian Commonwealth, 1659.
Baxter's Call to the Unconverted (translation), 1664.
The Indian Psalter, 1664.
The Communion of Churches, 1665.
Bayley's Practice of Piety (translation), 1665.
The Indian Primer (Indian), 1669.
The Logic Primer (Indian), 1672.
Harmony of the Gospels, 1678.
Shepard's Sincere Convert (translation), 1689.

[1] See *The Genealogical Register*, vol. xiv., p. 220. The following inscription was placed upon his tomb:

HERE LIE THE REMAINS
OF
JOHN ELIOT,
THE APOSTLE TO THE INDIANS,
ORDAINED OVER THE FIRST CHURCH,
NOVEMBER 5, 1632.
DIED MAY 20, 1690,
AGED
LXXXVI.

THE LABADIST COLONY IN MARYLAND.

THE LABADIST COLONY IN MARYLAND.

By Rev. BARTLETT BURLEIGH JAMES,

Pastor of the New North Carolina Ave. Methodist Protestant Church, Washington, D. C.

Abstract of a thesis accepted by the Johns Hopkins University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

I.

Doctrines of the Labadists.

Labadism was a late product of that spirit of reform which inaugurated the Protestant systems. Theologically it belonged to the school of Calvin. In its spirit it was conformable to that sentiment of ideal brotherhood, which has ever been a favorite mode of representing the fellowship of Christian believers.

Though distinctive in many of its dogmas, and altogether so in the mode of life which it prescribed, yet its articles of faith were in general accordance with those of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, of which it was an offshoot.

Labadism arose as a vigorous protest against the moral laxity and spiritual lassitude countenanced by the established Church.

Though like most profoundly spiritual movements it was influenced by its millennial hopes, yet it would be an error to place Labadism in the category of those Adventist sects which have a brief existence as prophets of the coming Kingdom, only to decline when the time of the supposed advent has passed by. These millennial hopes were not a part of the system itself, but only an expression of that spirit of profound pietism which in response to the announcement "Behold I come quickly," yearningly responds "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

The influences which shaped Labadism must be sought in the theological controversies of the day—controversies which, as one of the Dutch writers expresses it, "warmed the head and cooled the heart." The Cartesian and Aristotelian schools of philosophers found their counterparts in the Church in the adherents respectively of John Kock and Gysbert Voet. The Cocceian was the more influential, the Voetian the more evangelical. The Labadists were the radical wing of the Voetian party until their separation from the Reformed Church.

The theology of Labadism may be briefly summarized from the catechism prepared by Du Lignon, a prominent member of the Labadist community, as well as from other contemporary sources in the possession of the writer.[1]

The progressive plan of God for the salvation of the race was embraced in four covenants. The first was one *of nature and of works.* This was a race-covenant and was based on the laws of God as implanted in human nature. Its infraction by Adam produced from the inexhaustible stores of God's goodness the second covenant, "more excellent and holy than the first"—that of *grace.* During the continuance of this race-covenant, which extended up to the coming of Christ and which provided for the salvation—through the merits of the promised Redeemer—of all who came within its provisions, there was established a special covenant with Abraham. The benefits of this covenant extended to all his posterity and to those who became his spiritual children by entering into his belief. Its sign was circumcision, and the salvation of those who received it was no longer conditionally provided for under the general covenant of grace, but was assured through especial calling and election. This covenant was partly superseded by a special covenant with Moses. It is described by Du Lignon as "typical, ceremonial, literal and entirely external, hence only designed as temporary in order to set forth the grace and truth of

[1] *Catechismus of Christelÿke onderwyzinge*, etc., pt. III., P. Du Lignon, *Historisch Verhael Nopende der Labadisten Scheuringh*, Preface, v.

Christ by symbols."[1] The fourth and last covenant was the consummation of the revelation of Christ and of the plan of salvation. Faith was its condition, obedience its sign. Its symbols were baptism and the Lord's supper. The Church was to be a community of the elect, kept separate from the world by its pure teachings. Outside this Church there was no safety; from it there could be no severance. It was to be distinguished by two great periods; the one of sorrow, work, and crosses; the other, the millennial reign on earth of the church triumphant.[2]

The conviction that the Church organic comprehended in its membership many who were not included in the Church spiritual led to the adoption of the communistic mode of life by the Labadists, as an attempt to absolutely separate the believers from the unbelievers. In the narrow application of this tenet, the Church of believers came to be regarded as synonymous with the Church of the Labadists. In its rigid enforcement it made it necessary for husband and wife to separate if either were not of the elect Church.

Another tenet of Labadism to which its adherents gave extreme application was the doctrine of freedom from the dominion of law. The Sabbath was not considered as more sacred than other days, though they observed it in consideration of the scruples of others.[3]

In the administration of the ordinance of baptism, infant baptism was discountenanced because it could not be told beforehand whether the child would grow up as the elect of God or increase in sin. In lieu of infant baptism the child was brought before the church, presented, consecrated, and blessed. With regard to the Lord's supper, they declared it were better that it were never administered at all than that one unworthy person should partake of it.

The study of the scriptures was enjoined as a mode of

[1] *Catechismus*, III., 16. *Eucleria*, p. 9, v. v. *Historisch Verhael*, etc., p. 252. "De regten aard van't oude en niewve verbond," etc.

[2] *Het Heylige voor de Heyligen*, p. 724. *Eucleria*, p. 152. "Le Heraut du grand roy Jésus." "Saatste monarchie" in "Deopend van J. C."—H. van Demeter, *Catechismus*, III., 18.

[3] *Eucleria*, 106, v. v.

communication between the Holy Spirit and the Church. And yet it was pointed out that the Spirit was not limited to any medium, and that even without the study of the Bible the believer could not fail to be immediately instructed by the Spirit in all sound doctrine. Supreme reliance on the immediate presence and power of the Holy Spirit was the leading doctrine of Labadism. Labadism was pre-eminently a mystical form of faith, and this led to the extravagances which deprived it of perpetuity.

This in brief was the system of faith which was transplanted to the new world in the hope that there it might find conditions conducive to development.

II.

Government of the Labadists.

In its government the Church of the Labadists was a strongly centralized church, all mission communities being directed from the mother community at Weiward. The head of the community at Weiward was Yvon—De Labadie, the founder of Labadism, having died prior to the establishment of the church at that place. His designation was Father, while the heads of each of the daughter communities were styled bishop or superintendent. The next rank was that of the speaking brothers or sisters who constituted a class of preachers, teachers, and Bible readers and who had charge also of the instruction of the youth. Not only were the heads of the various sub-communities of the rank of superintendent, but at the large Weiward community also there were a number of persons of this rank who constituted an advisory council to the supreme head of the church. Aside from the deliberations of this superior body, a general assembly was sometimes held to which were admitted all Labadists above the rank of novice. It was the superior council that received the reports from the heads of the various daughter churches, and it was this council that passed upon all recommendations for elevation to the rank of full

brother or sister of those who had been received into any of the communities as novices. Thus the community in Maryland was kept under the direct controlling influence of the mother church.

At the head of the Maryland community was Bishop, or Superintendent, Sluyter. Unquestioning obedience to those placed over them was rigidly exacted of every member of the community. Dittleback (who had himself been a Labadist and had severed his connection with the church) assures us in his *Verval en Val Labadisten*, that Sluyter arrogated to himself and his wife absolute authority in the Maryland community, without regard to the provision in the Labadist system for an assembly of the brothers and sisters of the higher order.

Each member of the community had his or her assignment of work and duties. Order and system of the most admirable character prevailed in all departments of the community.[1] Some were in charge of the laundry, others of the culinary operations; others again were nurses and physicians. To such minute detail did the system extend that Dittleback assures us that a register was kept of the number of pieces of bread and butter consumed at a meal. The different families had dwellings according to their needs, though, by partitioning off the larger compartments, strict economy of space was observed. All rooms were at all times open to the pastors and to those who held oversight in their name. Those who joined the community resigned into the common stock all their possessions. Individuality in attire was suppressed. Ornaments were prohibited. "The haughtiness of the worldly spirit must be subdued," was a tenet far-reaching and well understood by each member of the community. Degrading tasks were assigned those who were suspected of pride. Samuel Bownas, a minister of the Society of Friends, in his record of his visit to the community gives a more particular account of their table discipline than can be found elsewhere. He describes the men and women as eating separately.

[1] *Labadie en de Labadisten*, H. Van Berkum, Part II., p. 113.

The men sat at the table covered and after a short space of time removed their hats each as he felt moved by the spirit to do so. After a silence of about ten minutes they again put on their hats, each in the individual manner in which he had uncovered. Each one as he put on his hat fell to eating without waiting for the others to do so. The meals of the Labadist were eaten in silence. At Weiward the meal was begun by chanting a psalm, a custom which appears to have fallen into disuse in the Maryland community.

Of the rigid discipline of the Labadists in others respects, a letter written by a member of the Maryland community and which is quoted by Dittleback gives a striking illustration. The writer complains bitterly that after having entered the community with a full surrender of himself, family goods and effects he was still compelled to go through a régime of mortifications almost diabolical in character. He says: "I could tolerate Weiward in some measure that there should be no fire in the cells, although it is cold there in winter, because turf is dear . . . but Sluyter would not permit them any fire in order to harden them and to mortify and subdue the sins of the body, while there was so much wood there that they had to burn it in the field to get it out of the way; but Sluyter had his own hearth well provided night and day."

III.

De Labadie and the Labadists.

The founder of Labadism was Jean de Labadie, a French mystic who was born at Bordeaux in 1610. He was educated in a Jesuit College and connected himself with that order. Severing his relations with the Jesuits he became a secular priest and attracted wide attention by reason of his remarkable power as a preacher, his reforming zeal and his erudition as a theologian. He became successively a Jansenist, a Carmelite, and a Protestant minister. His fame as a preacher at Geneva, Utrecht, and elsewhere brought him

into notoriety as one of the foremost ecclesiastics of Europe. After a brilliant career he embroiled himself with the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, in connection with which he was then working. He came under the suspicion of the civil authorities, so that he and his followers found no place to permanently locate and to develop the principles of the new church which he had established and which he styled the Evangelical. After the death of De Labadie, the church finally settled at Weiward, Friesland, and here was found for the first time conditions favorable for fully carrying out the communal principles which De Labadie had made the basis of his new church.

At Weiward also were developed the conditions which made it necessary to consider schemes of colonization. They had discovered that the plan of concentrating a very large force at any one point was impracticable in communal relations unless there could be originated forms of remunerative employment which would suffice to meet their needs. It is interesting to note the combination of religious and economic motives which conspired to form their resolution to plant a colony beyond the seas. Though it is reasonably certain that religious motives alone would not have made the colonial proposition acceptable to them, yet when physical necessity thrust the scheme upon their attention it at once assumed in their eyes the aspect of a religious movement for the conversion of the heathen.

A colony was first attempted at Surinam which had passed into the hands of the Dutch in compensation for New York, which was ceded to the British by the treaty of Breda, 1667. The sisters of the Governor and third-owner of the island were members of the Labadist community. Finding that this Eden of their hopes approximated more closely to a hospital they turned their eyes longingly towards New Netherlands.

Two commissioners were sent out to investigate the feasibility of colonizing these. Those chosen for the purpose were Peter Sluyter and Jasper Dankers, who concealed their identity under the assumed names of Vorstman and Schil-

ders. Sluyter was one of the most representative men of the community.

They left home on the eighth of June, 1679, and arrived at New York Saturday, the 23d of September. They kept a journal during their travels which was discovered and translated by the late Henry C. Murphy, the corresponding secretary of the Long Island Historical Society, and which is to be found in the Memoirs of that Society.[1]

During their stay in New York they improved every occasion for quietly insinuating their doctrines into the minds of any who seemed at all receptive to them.

The Labadist Commissioners were not favorably disposed towards New York as a place for a colony because, as they complain in their journal, the Governor (Andros) was a Catholic.

An event occurred during their stay in New York which in its ultimate result determined the place of the Labadist settlement and linked Maryland with a religious movement too modest in its local development to elicit more than a passing remark from her historians, but which has employed the pens of the Dutch writers as one of the most significant developments of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands. This event is mentioned in their journal under the date of October 10th, as follows: "From this time to the 22d of October nothing especial took place, except that we spoke to one Ephraim, a young trader, who was just arrived here, and who intended to go to the South River, where he usually dwelt, for which purpose he was only awaiting horses and men from there."[2]

This was Ephraim Herrmann, the eldest son of Augustine Herrmann, a Bohemian adventurer who had been sent by Governor Stuyvesant to Maryland as a Commissioner to negotiate with the Maryland authorities with regard to the contested boundary between that colony and Delaware. In consideration of the draughting of a map of Maryland and

[1] The original MS. is also in the possession of the Long Island Historical Society.

[2] *Memoirs Long Island Historical Soc.*, vol. i., p. 153.

Virginia for Lord Baltimore, he had received from him very extensive tracts of land in what is now Cecil County, Maryland, and New Castle County, Delaware, which he had erected into several manors, the more important of which were Bohemia Manor, his own residence, and St. Augustine Manor, which was lost to the family by the settlement of the boundary dispute adversely to Lord Baltimore's claims.

After some unavoidable delays, Ephraim Herrmann, accompanied by the two Labadists, started on their journey towards his home, which is given in detail with interesting incidents in the journal of the Labadists. Augustine Herrmann received the two Labadists kindly and entered into negotiations for the transfer to them of a tract of his extensive domain.

With this understanding the Labadists considered their mission fulfilled. Aside from other advantages it is not at all improbable that the policy of religious toleration pursued by Maryland's proprietaries was an influencing motive in their decision to establish their colony there.

While awaiting passage in New York the Labadists received a visit from a Pieter Beyaert,[1] whom they describe as "a deacon of the Dutch church, a very good sort of a person, whom God the Lord began to teach and enlighten, both in regard to the destruction of the world in general and of himself in particular."[2] This was none other than the ancestor of the Bayards of Delaware, the most illustrious descendant of whom is our present ambassador to the Court of St. James—the Hon. Thomas F. Bayard.

After the departure of the Labadists, the worthy Bohemian became suspicious that the hold they had upon his son Ephraim who later became an avowed convert to their faith might lead to their securing all his paternal estates, so that on the return of the Labadists they had to have recourse to law to compel Herrmann to conform to his agreement.

[1] He joined the Labadists in Maryland and in conformity to their requirement separated from his wife.

[2] *Memoirs Long Island Historical Soc.*, vol. i., 343–344.

IV.

THE LABADISTS AND THE MANOR.

In 1683 the two Labadists returned to Maryland bringing with them the nucleus of a colony. The land negotiated for was deeded to them and several others of their sect in company—one of whom was Peter Bayard. These latter transferred their interests to Sluyter and Dankers.

The additions to the community seem to have been principally made from among the Dutch of New York, though there does not appear to have been any very energetic attempt at all made towards winning proselytes to their faith.

The industrial activities of the Labadists show the influence upon them of new conditions. Slave labor and the cultivation of tobacco had been two objections advanced against the planting of a colony in America, yet notwithstanding the virtuous indignation expressed in their journal against these practices we find the Labadists engaged in cultivating tobacco extensively and employing for the purpose the slave labor that had been so abhorrent to them. In addition to the cultivation of tobacco, the culture of corn, flax and hemp, and cattle raising were prominent among their industries.

But the main purpose of the community was not rapidly accomplished. Their maximum development but slightly exceeded a hundred men, women, and children. The feeling of detestation for them expressed by Herrmann in a codicil to his will seems to have been very generally shared by their neighbors. This was doubtless in part due to the distrust engendered by their peculiarities and their seclusiveness of life. Their peculiarities were not favorable to the propagation of their faith; so that there seems to have been no attempt whatever, by energetic public preaching or by missionary efforts among the Indians, to realize the hopes of the mother community in sending them out. The spirit of zeal for the salvation of men that gave rise to Labadism was not manifested by the church in Maryland.

In 1698 a division of the "Labadie tract" was effected. Sluyter conveyed, for a mere nominal rent, the greater part of the land which he possessed to a number of the prominent men of the community. He reserved to himself one of the necks of the land and became very wealthy. In 1722 he died. Though up to that time there was still kept up some sort of organization among the Labadists, yet the division of 1698 marked the disintegration of the community, as did a similar division at Weiward, the mother community, at about the same time. There, however, the dissolution came by consultative action, and the Labadists returning to the Reformed Church became a leaven of profound spirituality, whose influence it is affirmed has never died. The dissolution in Maryland came by the logic of events. The community dwindled into extinction. Five years after the death of Sluyter the Labadists had ceased to exist as a community;[1] and were it not for certain prominent families descended from them, whose genealogy has been carefully traced by the Rev. E. Payson Mallary in his excellent monograph, the community on Bohemia Manor would be but a memory.

When we come to examine into the cause of the failure of Labadism to permanently establish itself in the new world, we find it to be attributable more to the nature of the system than to the environment in which it was placed. It was concerned more with intensive spiritual cultivation than with extensive propagation. It could only successfully operate upon those who were already longing to separate themselves from worldliness and were thus responsive to the profound pietistic aspirations which were the breath of the Labadist faith. The Labadist church was not a pioneer but a reforming church. But besides this it had, as a heritage from its founder, formularies and disciplinary methods, which militated against it even in those countries where it was originally developed. The communistic form of religion is not suited to longevity or large accomplishments and must ever remain a Utopian ideal.

The personal character of those at the head of the com-

[1] Samuel Bownas, *Life, Travels*, etc.

munity would of itself have militated against it. Sluyter, though a man of almost morbid religious tendencies, was yet a man of strong mercenary instincts; and the mercenary motive gained the ascendency over the religious in the community.

Had Sluyter been possessed of the strong traits of character which presaged success to the pioneers of Puritanism, Catholicism, Quakerism, or any of the other vigorous systems which had already, or which subsequently came with a strong hand to possess the new world for God, Labadism might have wrought itself into the religious life of the colonies as effectively as did any of these systems of faith. It may be that the decline of the mother church at Weiward had a disheartening effect upon the Maryland church. However that may be, Labadism failed to become an important and permanent factor in the ecclesiastical development of Maryland.

As it is, the knowledge of the Labadists has become such a fading tradition in the locality where their history was developed that very many who have been born and reared in the vicinity of Bohemia Manor, have never heard of the sect which once flourished in a mild way under the broad toleration of the religious policy of Maryland's proprietaries.

WESLEY AS A CHURCHMAN.

WESLEY AS A CHURCHMAN.

By Rev. JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER,

Pastor of the Chenango Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Binghamton, N. Y.

THE relation of John Wesley and early Methodism to the Church of England is one of the disputed questions of Church History. It has practical interest as well on account of the repeated attempts to induce the Methodists to return to the Church of England on the ground of the alleged unflinching loyalty of Wesley to the Church, and especially on account of his alleged High-Church notions. From documents lately printed some think that the common notion that Wesley maintained strictly evangelical notions after 1738 must be revised. It is therefore of interest to inquire what was Wesley's real attitude toward the Church of his fathers.

It is acknowledged on all hands that previous to his conversion in 1738 Wesley was an ardent High Churchman. He recommended confession, he practised weekly communion, he observed all the festivals, he observed the fasts on Wednesdays and Fridays, he mixed the sacramental wine with water, and in other respects anticipated the churchly enthusiasm of the Oxford reformers of 1833. Now it would be indeed remarkable if no trace of these sentiments appeared after the spiritual revolution of 1738, if all of this ritualistic fervor completely died at his conversion. I think there are traces of High-Church ideas after this. Wesley always maintained a strict theory as to the Lord's Supper. In 1788 he republished a sermon he had written in Oxford in 1733, and he says in the preface: "I have added very little, but retrenched much, as I then used more words than I do now. But I thank God that I have not seen cause to alter my sentiments in any point which is therein delivered."

He here calls the sacrament the "Christian sacrifice," but it is evident this is not to be interpreted too literally, as he thought that the body and blood of Christ are to be received in a spiritual manner. He says: "As our bodies are strengthened by bread and wine, so are our souls by these tokens of the body and blood of Christ." "The design of this sacrament is the continual remembrance of the death of Christ by eating bread and drinking wine, which are the outward signs of the inward grace, the body and blood of Christ." In this sermon he also urges "constant communion," that is, not simply weekly communion but communion as frequent as possible. In 1745 he printed extracts from a eucharistical volume by Dr. Brevint as a preface to some sacramental hymns by him and Charles. This volume is quoted at length by High-Church writers as evidence of Wesley's sacramentarianism. I have read all the parts which seem to look in this direction, and I have not found anything inconsistent with the historic doctrine of the English Church that the body and blood of Christ are partaken of in the sacrament in a spiritual manner. Wesley undoubtedly held to the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, but that presence was spiritual and not corporeal. Brevint teaches that the sacrament is a sacrifice, but only in a figurative or symbolic sense. As to baptism, Wesley continued to hold to a theory of baptismal regeneration. "It is certain," he says, "that our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again, and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition." As to adults, he held that baptism had no efficacy in itself. "Whatever be the case with infants, it is sure that all of riper years who are baptized are not at the same time born again." In his note on Acts xxii., 16, speaking of adults he says: "Baptism administered to real penitents is both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily, in the primitive Church, bestow this on any except through this means." But this opinion as to infants' baptismal regeneration he held privately, and never tried to enforce it on his preachers, many of whom rejected

it; and when he prepared his Sunday Service in 1784, he eliminated all signs of the doctrine in his revision of the XXXIX Articles, a fact which shows that his final conclusion was not to insist on the doctrine in any sense.[1]

Mr. Urlin, the High-Church biographer and enthusiastic student and lover of Wesley, came into possession of certain papers which he published for the first time. Among them was a fragment by Wesley which Mr. Urlin dates about 1741, and which reads as follows:—

"I believe [myself][2] it a duty to observe [so far as I can without breaking communion with my own church][2]:

"1. To baptize by immersion.

"2. To use water, Oblation of Elements, Invocation, Alms, a Prothesis to the Eucharist.

"3. To pray for the faithful departed.

"4. To pray standing on Sunday in Pentecost.

"5. To observe Saturday and Sunday Pentecost as festival. I think it prudent (our own Church not considered)—

"1. To observe the Stations [protracted services on certain days accompanied by fast].

"2. Lent, especially the Holy Week.

"3. To turn to the East at the Creed."

That is certainly a pretty formidable list of ritualistic observances. Mr. Urlin argues, but on what must be considered frail ground, that this MS. belongs to 1741.[3] I think on the contrary, from internal evidence, there being no external evidence whatever, that this bit of High-Church literature antedates 1738, and belongs either to Wesley's Oxford or Georgia life. The observances mentioned in the list are thoroughly consonant with Wesley's notions and manner of life at that time, but after he began his evangelistic career they are thoroughly out of tune with all his teaching, and besides it was physically impossible to observe them. The fact that Wesley never published these notes shows that he

[1] *Cf.*, Rigg, *Churchmanship of John Wesley*, Lond., 1879; new ed., 1893.

[2] These words in brackets appear to have a line drawn through them with the pen.

[3] See R. Denny Urlin, *Wesley's Place in Church History*, Lond., 1870, and his *Churchman's Life of John Wesley*, Lond., 1886.

considered them not to represent his matured convictions, and the fact that he did not destroy them shows that he considered them important in giving a view of his spiritual history.

A strong indirect evidence of the persistent influence of Wesley's early ritualistic enthusiasm, though turned into another channel, is the earnest, almost stern, ascetic ethical and religious precepts which were embodied in his Rules for preachers, in his Rules for the Societies, and in his Rules for the Bands. I do not know of any one who has called attention to this.

Let us now seek an actual history of Wesley's attitude toward the Church of England. His association with the Moravians had profoundly affected him, and their explanation of the way of salvation convinced him that salvation may be instantaneous, and that it is to be sought by faith. This led to that remarkable experience in Aldersgate Street in May, 1738, which Wesley himself called his "conversion," a word which he afterwards retracted as too strong. A few days afterward he went so far as to declare that previous to that experience he had never been a Christian at all, but later reflection led him to correct this, and to say that he had indeed the faith of a servant, that he had been all along a Christian, but that he served God in a servile way without the gladness and triumph that comes from the full trust of a child. At any rate in that Aldersgate experience Methodism was born. On the strength of that he went forth calling sinners to immediate repentance and salvation. Miss Wedgwood, in her thoughtful study of Wesley and the Evangelical Revival, has correctly judged the immense importance of that experience. She says that it meant that the emphasis of Wesley, and so of modern Protestanism, was to be changed from baptism to conversion.[1] That experience cut up Wesley's High-Church theology by the roots. I mean in its essential feature. No longer was the stress to be laid upon the sacraments, upon observances and rites as means of salvation, but solely upon faith, and the

[1] *John Wesley and the Evangelical Reaction of the 18th Century*, p. 157.

great means of conversion was preaching and not catechizing and worship. From this all the important features of the Methodist revival followed as a matter of course: (1) the organization of the converted into societies and classes, where those who had been made kings and priests unto God testified of their experience in divine things; (2) the employment of lay-preachers, who were sent forth everywhere preaching the Gospel, and bringing multitudes to Christ; (3) extemporaneous prayer in the divine service. It followed also that sacramentarian theology disappeared, and the theology of Christian experience took its place.

Any one with the least discernment could see that such a movement as that foreboded ill to the established Church, that it had within it the seed of separation. As early as October, 1739, Wesley's brother Samuel, who bitterly lamented the new departure, wrote as follows to his mother:

"It was with exceeding concern and grief that I heard you had countenanced a spreading delusion, so far as to be one of Jack's congregation. Is it not enough that I am bereft of both my brothers, but must my mother follow too? I earnestly beseech the Almighty to preserve you from joining a schism at the close of your life, as you were unfortunately engaged in one at the beginning of it. It will cost you many a protest, should you retain your integrity, as I hope to God you will. They boast of you already as a disciple. They design separation. They are already forbidden all the pulpits in London; and to preach in the diocese is actual schism. In all likelihood, it will come to the same all over England, if the bishops have courage enough. They leave all the liturgy in the fields, and though Mr. Whitefield expresses his value for it, he never once read it to his tatterdemalions on a common. Their societies are sufficient to dissolve all other societies but their own. Will any man of common sense, or spirit, suffer any domestic to be in a band, engaged to relate to five or to ten people everything, without reserve, that concerns the person's conscience, how much soever it may concern the family? Ought any married persons to be there unless husband and wife be there together? This is literally putting asunder what God has joined together.

"As I told Jack, I am not afraid the Church should excommunicate him (discipline is at too low an ebb), but that

he should excommunicate the Church. It is pretty near it. Holiness and good works are not so much as conditions of our acceptance with God. Love feasts are introduced, and extemporary prayers, and expositions of Scripture, which last are enough to bring in all confusion; nor is it likely they will want any miracles to support them. He only who ruleth the madness of the people can stop them from being a formed sect. Ecclesiastical censures have lost their terrors; thank fanaticism on the one hand, and atheism on the other. To talk of persecution from thence is mere insult. It is

> " 'To call the bishop, Grey-beard Goff,
> And make his power as mere a scoff,
> As Dagon, when his hands were off.' "[1]

It does not argue well for Wesley's own prescience that he did not have the sagacity of his brother in discerning the trend of his movement. In fact there is evidence that he did, and he never seemed to lose any sleep over the prospect, although he was all the while conscientiously and earnestly attached to the Church. At the first conference in 1744, it was resolved (1) to defend the doctrine of the Church of England, both by their preaching and living; (2) to obey the bishops in all things indifferent; (3) to observe the canons of the Church as far as they could with a safe conscience; and, finally, to exert themselves to the utmost not to entail a schism in the Church by their hearers forming themselves into a distinct sect. They agreed, however, that they must not reject the present opportunity of saving souls for fear of consequences which might possibly or probably happen after they were dead.[2] Thus at the very first conference Wesley and his preachers laid down a programme to which they continually adhered as long as the founder lived, viz., a qualified adherence to the Church, but at the sacrifice of no principle, at the expense of no limitation on the Movement, and with no fear of far-off consequences.[3]

There is no doubt that Wesley had great respect for Episcopal church government, and that he firmly believed that

[1] Priestley's *Letters*, p. 108, Tyerman, *Life of Wesley*, i., 286–87.

[2] Tyerman, i., 444.

[3] The same principles appear in *Works*, i., 486–89, last Lond. ed.

for the sake of order no unordained man should administer the sacraments. But how early his High-Church theories were superseded, or were in the process of being superseded, is afforded by this minute in his second conference, 1745, which is certainly ingenious and interesting, whatever else may be said of it.

"*Q.* 1. Can he be a spiritual governor of the Church who is not a believer or a member of it?

"*A.* It seems not; though he may be a governor in outward things by a power derived from the king.[1]

"*Q.* 2. What are properly the laws of the Church of England?

"*A.* The Rubrics; and to those we submit as the ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake.

"*Q.* 3. Is not the will of one governor a law?

"*A.* No; not of any governor, temporal or spiritual. Therefore, if any bishop wills that I should not preach the Gospel his will is no law to me.[2]

"*Q.* 4. But what if he produce a law against your preaching?

"*A.* I am to obey God rather than man.

"*Q.* 5. Is Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent church government most agreeable to reason?

"*A.* The plain origin of church government seems to be this: Christ sends forth a preacher of the Gospel. Some who hear him repent and believe the Gospel. They then desire him to watch over them, to build them up in the faith, and to guide their souls in the paths of righteousness. Here, then, is an independent congregation, subject to no pastor but their own, neither liable to be controlled in things spiritual by any other man or body of men whatever. But soon after, some from other parts, who are occasionally present while he speaks in the name of Him that sent him, beseech him to come over to help them also. Knowing it to be the will of God, he consents, yet not till he has conferred with the wisest and holiest of his congregation, and with their advice, appointed one or more who have gifts and grace to

[1] In this Wesley releases himself from obedience to all unconverted bishops.

[2] Compare with this John Henry Newman's respect for his bishops in his Tractarian period. "What to me was *jure divine* was the voice of my bishop in his own person. My own bishop was my pope."—*Apologia pro Vita Sua*, 5th ed., N. Y., p. 97.

watch over the flock till his return. If it pleases God to raise another flock in the new place, before he leaves them he does the same thing, appointing one whom God has fitted for the work to watch over these souls also. In like manner, in every place where it pleases God to gather a little flock by his word, he appoints one in his absence to take the oversight of the rest, and to assist them of the abilities which God giveth. These are deacons or servants of the Church, and look on the first pastor as their common father. And all these congregations regard him in the same light, and esteem him still as the shepherd of their souls. These congregations are not absolutely independent, they depend on one pastor, though not on each other. As these congregations increase, and as their deacons grow in years and grace, they need other subordinate deacons and helpers, in respect to whom they may be called presbyters or elders, as their father in the Lord may be called the bishop or overseer of them all.

"*Q.* 6. Is mutual consent absolutely necessary between the pastor and his flock?

"*A.* No question. I cannot guide any soul unless he consent to be guided by me. Neither can any one soul force me to guide him if I consent not.

"*Q.* 7. Does the ceasing of this consent on either side dissolve that relation?

"*A.* It must in the very nature of things. If a man no longer consent to be guided by me, I am no longer his guide. I am free. If one will not guide me any longer I am free to seek one who will."[1]

This simple and unaffected exposition of primitive church polity, after the strictest Congregational pattern, is a remarkable production for an ardent son of the Church of England. It is certainly a rare document to come from one whom some writers claim, and with plausible reason, as at this time a High Churchman. This exposition was not concealed among his papers, but published immediately in the authoritative Minutes of his Conference. And yet it is an illustration of one of those strange transitions in Wesley's thought, and of his holding apparently contradictory positions, a fact which has given so much trouble to both Methodists and Anglicans—that in December of that same

[1] *Minutes of Conference*, i., 26–27 (last London ed.).

year, 1745, he wrote to his brother-in-law, Westley Hall, who had urged him to renounce the Church of England, a letter in which he came out strongly for the apostolic authority of the threefold ministry. He says:

"We believe it would not be right for us to administer either baptism or the Lord's supper, unless we had a commission to do so from those bishops whom we apprehend to be in a succession from the apostles. And yet we allow these bishops are the successors of those who were dependent on the bishop of Rome.

"We believe there is and always was in every Christian Church, whether dependent on the bishop of Rome or not, an outward priesthood, ordained by Jesus Christ, and outward sacrifice offered therein, by men authorized to act as ambassadors of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.

"We believe that the threefold order of ministers, which you seem to mean by papal hierarchy and prelacy, is not only authorized by its apostolical institution, but also by the written word."[1]

This is certainly explicit enough to satisfy any High Churchman. In the same letter he says he will follow the laws of the Church of England only as far as his conscience will permit. But notice this. On the same page of his Journal, under date of Jan. 20, 1746, Wesley writes:

"I set out for Bristol. On the road I read over Lord King's account of the Primitive Church. In spite of the vehement prejudice of my education, I was ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draught; but if so, it would follow that bishops and presbyters are (essentially) of one order, and that originally every Christian congregation was a Church independent of all others."

In spite, therefore, of his bold words to Hall, it would seem after all that the declaration of his Conference of 1745, in which he virtually styled his preachers deacons and presbyters, would stand. But at his next Conference he tried to come to a middle position. After calling a national Church a "merely political institution," he says:

[1] *Works*, ii., 4.

"*Q.* Are the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons plainly described in the New Testament?

"*A.* We think they are; and believe they generally obtained in the Apostolic age.

"*Q.* But are you assured that God designed the same plan should obtain in all Churches, throughout all ages?

"*A.* We are not assured of this; because we do not know that it is inserted in Holy Writ.

"*Q.* If this plan were essential to a Christian Church, what must become of all foreign reformed Churches?

"*A.* It would follow that they are no parts of the Church of Christ. A consequence full of shocking absurdity.

"*Q.* In what age was the divine right of episcopacy first asserted in England?

"*A.* About the middle of Queen Elizabeth's reign. Till then all the bishops and clergy in England continually allowed, and joined in, the ministrations of those who were not episcopally ordained.

"*Q.* Must there not be numberless accidental varieties in the government of the various Churches?

"*A.* There must in the nature of things. For, as God variously dispenses his gifts of nature, providence, and grace, both the offices themselves and the officers in each ought to be varied from time to time.

"*Q.* Why is it that there should be no determinate plan of Church government appointed in Scripture?

"*A.* Without doubt, because the wisdom of God had regard to a necessary variety.

"*Q.* Was there any thought of uniformity in the government of all Churches until the time of Constantine?

"*A.* It is certain there was not, and would not have been then, had men consulted the word of God only." [1]

If, therefore, Wesley spoke as a High Churchman to Hall in December, 1745, he spoke as a Low Churchman in the summer of 1747. Tyerman says that ever after this the opinions of Wesley on ecclesiastical polity were substantially those of dissenters, and although this on the whole is a fair induction, there are incongruous and perplexing elements yet left in the question of Wesley's Churchmanship.

Nearly ten years after this, we find Wesley still firm in his broad views as to the Church, and confirmed in them by

[1] *Minutes*, ed. 1862, i., 36; Tyerman, i., 509.

Bishop Stillingfleet's *Irenicon*. In a letter to a clergyman dated July 3, 1756, he says:

"I still believe the Episcopal form of Church government to be scriptural and apostolical. I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is prescribed in Scripture, I do not believe. This opinion, which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet's *Irenicon*. I think that he has unanswerably proved that neither Christ nor his apostles have ever prescribed any form of Church government, and that the plea of divine right for diocesan episcopacy was never heard of in the primitive Church.

"As to heresy and schism, I cannot find one text in the Bible where they are taken in the modern sense. I remember no one Scripture wherein heresy signifies error in opinion, whether fundamental or not, nor any wherein schism signifies a separation from the Church, whether with cause or without."[1]

In 1761 Wesley, answering a Roman Catholic, claims a true succession for the Reformed Churches, but it is a spiritual succession, and he says that the Apostolical Succession, on which the validity of the Roman Catholic bishops rests, has no evidence. "I could never see it proved; and I am persuaded I never shall."[2] And far on in the evening of his life, he declared himself to the same intent. In a letter to his brother Charles, who had upbraided him severely for ordaining preachers for America, he says (1785):

"For these forty years I have been in doubt concerning the question—what obedience is due to

'Heathenish priests and mitred infidels.'[3]

I have from time to time proposed my doubts to the most pious and sensible clergymen I know. But they gave me no satisfaction. Rather, they seemed to be puzzled as well

[1] Tyerman, ii., 244.

[2] *Journal*, February, 1761 (*Works*, iii., 425).

[3] This is a quotation from one of Charles Wesley's early poems, in which he describes the Church clergy. This sentiment Charles afterward withdrew as too strong.

as me. Obedience I always paid to the bishops, in obedience to the laws of the land. But I cannot see that I am under any obligations to obey them further than those laws require. It is in obedience to these laws that I have never exercised in England the power which I believe God has given me. I firmly believe I am a scriptural Ἐπίσκοπος as much as any man in England, or in Europe: for the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove."[1]

The question of the separation of the Methodists from the Church of England was a question in perpetual discussion in the Conferences from the first Conference almost to the close of Wesley's life. The very fact that Wesley allowed it to come up constantly, that it was always a mooted question, and that Wesley's solution of it was: For the present we remain in the Church, let the future take care of itself—thus referring its final solution to his successors, shows that his attachment to the Church of England, though hearty, rested on expediency and not on divine obligation. I have read the decision of all the Conferences on this question, and Wesley's voluminous correspondence, and I say that the sum of it is: Whether or no separation is lawful, it is not expedient. Sometimes he was more concerned for union, at other times he was less concerned. At one time he waives it aside as an external question of no consequence. "I dare not, in conscience," he says, speaking of this, "spend my time and strength on externals. If, as my Lady [Huntingdon] says, all outward establishments are Babel, so is this establishment. Let it stand for me. I neither set it up, nor pull it down. But let you [he is writing to Charles] and I build up the city of God."[2] A most important document is the letter of Wesley to the Rev. Samuel Walker, a zealous clergyman in Truro, written after the Conference of 1755. In this he gives the reasons brought forward in the debates by those who favored separation. 1. Though the liturgy is excellent, it is "absurd and sinful to declare such

[1] Jackson, *Life of Charles Wesley*, pp. 730–31 (N. Y. ed.), ii., 394–96 (1st Lond. ed.).

[2] June 28, 1755, Tyerman, ii., 206.

an assent and consent to any merely human composition," as is required to it. 2. Though they did not object to the use of forms, they durst not confine themselves to them. 3. Because they considered the decretals of the Church as the "very dregs of popery," and "many of the canons as grossly wicked and absurd. The spirit which they breathe is throughout popish and anti-Christian. Nothing can be more diabolical than the *ipso-facto* excommunication so often denounced therein, while the whole method of executing the canons in our spiritual courts is too bad to be tolerated, not in a Christian, but in a Mohammedan or pagan nation." 4. Because they feared that many of the Church of England ministers neither lived the Gospel, taught it, nor knew it, and because they doubted "whether it was lawful to attend the ministrations of those whom God had not sent to minister." 5. Because the doctrines preached by these clergymen were "not only wrong, but fundamentally so, and subversive of the whole Gospel." Then Wesley says: "I will freely acknowledge that I cannot answer these arguments to my own satisfaction; so that my conclusion, which I cannot yet give up, that it is lawful to continue in the Church, stands almost without any premises that are able to bear its weight." Certainly that is a strange confession for a High Churchman. He then says: "The original doctrines of the Church of England are sound, and I know her worship is, in the main, pure and spiritual; but if the essence of the Church of England, considered as such, consists in her orders and laws, many of which I myself can say nothing for, and not in her worships and doctrines, those who separate from her have a far stronger plea than I was ever sensible of."[1] I could give many other quotations from Wesley equally significant.

But, as a matter of fact, Wesley had himself in effect separated himself from the Church. He had from the very beginning formally and solemnly set apart men to the work of preaching the Gospel, though not with the laying on of hands, and sent them into parishes of the Church of Eng-

[1] Tyerman, ii., 207–8; *Meth. Mag.*, 1779, p. 371.

land to preach, and to gather the people into societies entirely separate from the Church. This was clearly contrary to the rules of the Church of England and of every other Church. The same thing done to-day would not be tolerated by any Church in the world. Walker, of Truro, Wesley's friend, saw this. He says: "Lay-preachers, being contrary to the constitution of the Church of England, are, as far as that point goes, a separation from it." He refers to the "continual bar kept up between you [Wesley] and any regular clergyman, who cannot in conscience fall in with this measure. The most he can do is not to forbid them; he cannot take them by the hand. And so there must be two disunited ministrations of the word in the same place by people who yet do call themselves of the Church of England."[1] Thomas Adam, rector of Wintringham, also a friend of the Wesleys, is equally explicit as to the fatal breach between Methodism and the Church. Writing in 1756 he says: "Methodism, as to its external form, is such a deviation from the rule and constitution of the Church of England, that all attempts to render it consistent must be vain. Lay-preaching is a manifest irregularity, and would not be endured in any Christian society."[2] He says there can be no basis of union consistent with the principles of both, and that the Methodists must be left alone. Wesley, over and over again, laid down this platform: "I cannot give up lay preaching, organization of societies, extemporary prayers." These he considered of more importance than Church order. At the same time he would not allow his preachers to administer the sacraments, and in a letter of 1756 he gives the reason. He says that there is absolute necessity for lay preaching, for otherwise thousands of souls would perish everlastingly, but there is not absolute necessity for lay administering, for not one soul will perish for want of it,—a characteristic remark of Wesley, and one which shows the immense drift from his sacramentarianism of 1755 to his evangelicalism of 1756.

[1] *Life of Samuel Walker, of Truro*, p. 207; Tyerman, ii., 245-46.
[2] *Life of Walker*, p. 224; Tyerman, ii., 251.

Over against this whole tendency of Methodism under John Wesley's hand, a tendency all the time away from the Church of England, not to speak of High Church theories, and over against these repeated testimonies of Wesley, a striking sermon is brought forward. It is the famous Dathan and Abiram sermon of 1789, and is his last effort to prevent administration of the sacraments by his preachers. The upshot of it is this: You were not appointed to administer the sacraments, a function which belongs to the priestly or ministerial office, and therefore you are usurping rights if you do it. Wesley firmly maintained that for the sake of order, and to preserve the full dignity of the clerical office, the sacraments should be kept in the hands of ordained men. He fully believed that he had the power to ordain them for this, and he exercised that power on three separate occasions; but those who were not so appointed should keep to their proper work.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE WESTERN CHURCH TOWARDS THE STUDY OF THE LATIN CLASSICS IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE WESTERN CHURCH TOWARDS THE STUDY OF THE LATIN CLASSICS IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES.

By Professor DANA CARLETON MUNRO,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

In this paper I propose to discuss only the period before 1100 A.D., only the Latin classics, and only the western part of Christian Europe. The later centuries would need a special discussion, as early in the twelfth century new factors were at work which modified materially the study and influence of the classics. I mention the Latin classics, although what is said will in general hold true of the Greek classics as far as they found any students. But in the case of the latter, there was during these centuries an additional reason for neglecting them. In the tenth and eleventh centuries a knowledge of the Greek classics might have given rise to the suspicion of schism, as the knowledge of Hebrew caused a suspicion of Judaistic principles. The limitation to the west of Europe calls for no comment, and is made only to avoid any possible misconceptions.

In reading the utterances of churchmen relative to the classics, in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, one is reminded of Gratian's *Concordantia Canonum Discordantium*, or better yet, of the great work which suggested to Gratian his title, Abælard's *Sic et Non*. At first the differences seem unexplainable, and modern writers have held very opposite opinions as to the mediæval judgment of the value of the classics. I need only recall to you the condemnatory utterances of Hallam, the refutation by Maitland, the laudatory views of Schaarschmidt and Montalambert, or

the ridicule cast by Comparetti. But I think a little closer study will enable us to bring the discordant canons into harmony, and to explain what the attitude of the church really was.

In order to do this it is necessary to glance at the teachings of the early Fathers. Any one who is at all familiar with the trend of mediæval thought, knows how fully it was governed by traditions, and that it can be understood only by tracing its ideas back to their sources. Accordingly I shall present briefly the attitude of the early Fathers towards the study of the profane literature, and in this part of the paper I shall dwell especially on St. Augustine and St. Jerome, the Fathers who had the greatest influence on the early Middle Ages.

In the apologetic literature of the second century we find two opposite tendencies. Justin Martyr attempted to reconcile philosophy and Christianity. In his writings he tried to show that the new doctrine was in accord in many points with the older teaching. He wished to fuse together Christianity and all that was best in the ancient learning. Tertullian, on the other hand, represented the opposite opinion. He rejected entirely the pagan philosophy. These two tendencies existed continuously from this time until the days of St. Jerome, and it was long a question which would get the upper hand. Origen recommended the study of the classics, using the two similes of the children of Israel spoiling the Egyptians and taking the Canaanite wives. In the same way, he argued, a Christian could gain advantage from the classics.[1] Each of these similes was made to do yeoman service for a thousand years by the advocates of pagan learning.

A little later the stricter view was more prominent, owing to the persecutions. Arnobius opposed the study of the classics and the Apostolic Constitutions enjoined upon the laity, "*abstine te ab omnibus gentilium libris.*"[2] Lactantius, however, modelled his writings on classical productions, and threw his

[1] Origen, *Ep. ad Greg.* in Migne: *Patrolog. grac.*, xi., 88.

[2] Book i., ch. 6.

weight into the opposite scale.[1] We get a vivid glimpse of the intensity of feeling on this question from the Edict of the Emperor Julian and the opposition which it provoked. He forbade the Christians to teach in the schools, on the ground of their opposition to the classics.[2] Liberal Christians felt that this was a severe blow, and it was considered unjust even by such an admirer of Julian as Ammianus Marcellinus.[3] Two contemporaries, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, favored such study, although the former disapproved of teaching the fables of the pagans to young churchmen, at the same time that he recommended the study of Homer as a book which led to virtue.[4]

Of vastly greater importance, however, for the Middle Ages were the teachings of St. Jerome and St. Augustine, and I have run over the earlier Fathers merely to explain the attitude of these two. St. Jerome, himself a great scholar and ardent lover of the classics, taught them to his pupils and advised others to study them constantly in their youth.[5] He was attacked for this by Rufinus, but argued in reply that they could be used as the Israelites used the heathen wives.[6] He proved by the example of Daniel that it was not a sin to be versed in pagan learning.[7] He considered it necessary for young students to use the classics, but thought it wrong to continue such study after they had gotten the necessary instruction, when they were to devote themselves to the Holy Scriptures.[8] For,

[1] Cp. Ebert: *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, 2te Aufl., vol. 1., p. 113.

[2] Julian, Ep. 42.

[3] Book xxii., ch. 10, at end.

[4] Mabillon: *Réflexions*, i., 187 and 209, quoted in Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, vi., 207, n.

[5] Rufini Aquileiens, *Apolog.*, lib. ii., c. 8, in Migne: *Patrologiæ latinæ*, xxi., 592.

[6] Ep. 70, *ad Magnum*, in Migne: *Pat. lat.*, xxii., 666.

[7] *Comment. in* 1 *c. Danielis*, Migne: *Pat. lat.*, xxv., 497.

[8] "Sacerdotis Dei omissis Evangeliis et Prophetis videmus Comœdias legere, amatoria bucolicorum versuum verba canere, Virgilium tenere; et id, quod in pueris necessitatis est, crimen in se facere voluptatis." Ep. 21, *ap Damasum*, in Migne: *Pat. lat.*, xxii., 386.

as he said, "What comparison is there between light and darkness, between the Psalter and Horace, between the Gospels and Virgil, between the Apostles and Cicero?"[1] He himself had been deterred from further study of Cicero by the angel's stern rebuke, when the latter said that he was a Ciceronian, not a Christian.[2] He blamed bishops who taught the classics to their sons, and said that those who were occupied in secular studies wandered in the vanity and obscurity of their senses.[3] In regard to those who had devoted themselves to the monastic life, he said it was the duty of a monk not to teach but to weep.[4]

St. Augustine expressed himself in a similarly inconsistent manner. He was fond of the classics until his extreme old age. He considered the study of classical literature, grammar, dialectics, rhetoric, and mathematics as the necessary discipline of the human mind for understanding the highest divine truth. He wished boys to be compelled in their early youth to study these industriously.[5] He argued that the fact that these contained pagan superstitions was no reason for discarding them wholly. They were very useful for understanding the Holy Scriptures and should be used as the Israelites used the spoils of Egypt.[6] But in all these studies the Christian should observe the rule, *ne quid nimis*.[7] Yet in his Confessions he praises the early lessons, in which he learned to read and write, to the disparagement of the later lessons in grammar.[8] "Over the thresholds of the grammar schools," says Augustine, "veils are hung, but

[1] Ep. 22, *ad Eustochium*.

[2] *Ibid.*, Migne, xxii., 416.

[3] *Comment.* lib. ii., *ad Cap. 4, Ep. ad Ephes.* in Migne, xxvi., 504, and lib. iii., *ad Cap. 6, Ep. ad Ephes.*, ibid., 540.

[4] Cp. Ambrose, Ep., lxiii.

[5] Augustin. *de Ordine*, ii., 44.

[6] *De Doct. Christ.*, ii., 18, and ii., 40.

[7] *Ibid.*, ii., 39.

[8] Possibly it is well to explain that, at this time and during the whole of the period of which I am treating, grammar included the study and intrepretation of the classical authors. It was only in the thirteenth century that these subjects were excluded from the definition of grammar, and that the term began to have about its modern meaning.

these indicate not so much the dignity of secrecy as the cloak of error."[1] And he did not hold it necessary for Christians to be educated, for he said, *indocti cælum rapiunt.*[2]

From these brief summaries we can see how easy it was for the mediæval scholars to cull arguments from Augustine or Jerome in favor of any view they chose to hold. In regard to bishops the view was fairly uniform in the early centuries. As they were especially devoted to the service of God, they ought to refrain from the study of the classics. The Fourth Council of Carthage in 398 had ordered that "*Episcopus Gentilium libros non legat; Hæreticorum autem, pro necessitate, aut tempore.*"[3] Apollinaris Sidonius, who had been such a lover of classical literature, and who had modelled all his early writings on what he believed to be the best pagan authorities, when he became a bishop in 472, gave up all such imitations as unbecoming for his office.[4] A similar view was held as to the monks. Cassian, contemporary with St. Jerome, speaks decidedly on the duty of those who had devoted themselves to the monastic profession. They must not study the classics. If pure, they will understand the Scriptures without study.[5] If, unfortunately, they have studied the classics in the past, they are to strive to forget them by mortifying the flesh and devoting themselves to the study of the Holy Scriptures.[6] Fortunately for the future of education, such a narrow view did not prevail. St. Benedict made provision in his Rule for four hours of reading or study each day.[7] St. Cæsarius of Arles

[1] *Confessiones*, i., ch. 13.

[2] *Ibid.*, viii., 8.

[3] Canon 21.

[4] Cp. Hodgkin: *Italy and Her Invaders*, 2d ed., vol. ii., p. 319.

[5] "Monachum ad Scripturarum notitiam pertingere cupientem, nequaquam debere labores suos erga commentatorum libros impendere, sed potius omnem mentis industriam et intentionem cordis erga emundationem vitiorum carnalium detinere Quibus expulsis confestim cordis oculi, sublato velamine passionum, sacramenta Scripturarum velut naturaliter incipient contemplari." Cassian. *de cœnob. institut.*, v., 34 in Migne: *Pat. lat.*, xlix., 230.

[6] Cassianus: *Collat.*, xiv., 13, in Migne, xlix., 979.

[7] *Regula Benedicti*, c. 48.

required of his nuns two hours of study daily.[1] Cassiodorus urged the pursuit of profane learning, and to him, more than to any one else, is due the introduction of such studies into the monasteries. His activity and influence were of the highest importance for all the later history of education. But it is interesting to note that, although he spent much of his time in transcribing books, yet as a monk he confined his labors wholly to religious literature.[2]

In the troubled period of the sixth century it was inevitable that a stricter view should prevail. Gregory the Great is the best example. His letter to the bishop of Milan is well known. "I have been informed—I cannot repeat it without shame—that you, my brother, are teaching certain persons grammar. At this I was so grieved and felt so strong disgust that my former feelings were changed to groans and sadness; because the same mouth cannot utter the praises of Jupiter and Christ." "It is execrable that such a thing should be told of a priest."[3] That his opposition to classical literature cannot be explained away, as is attempted by Maitland, following the example of Gratian, is evident from other passages in Gregory's writings. "I do not shun at all the confusion of barbarians. I despise the proper constructions and cases, because I think it very unfitting that the words of the celestial oracle should be restricted by the rules of Donatus."[4] Gregory's opinion is evidently the same as that held in the preceding centuries, that a bishop ought not to engage in classical studies. From Isidore of Seville we can learn that the old idea still prevailed as to the duty of a monk. In his Etymologies, Isidore arranged and edited for Christians the pagan literature of antiquity, but in his Rule he forbade the monks to study the classics, because secular knowledge tempted the soul to pride.[5]

[1] *Cæsarii regula ad virgines*, c. 17, in Migne, lxvii., 1109.

[2] Cassiodorus: *De institut. divin. litter.*, c., 28, in Migne, lxx., 1141. See also c. 15, 23, 30, etc., in same treatise.

[3] Gregor. I. *Ep. ad Desiderium*, ix., 48.

[4] Ep. prefixed to *Exposit. Job.* See Jaffé: *Regesta*, 1368.

[5] Isidore, *Sententiarum* lib. iii., c. 13 *de libris gentilium*, in Migne, lxxxiii., 685, and *ibid.*: *Regula ad monach.*, c. 8, *ibid.*, 877.

When we turn to the proper subject of this paper, the period from 800 to 1100 A.D., we are struck by a great change which had occurred since the earlier period. Teaching was almost wholly in the hands of the monks or influenced by them. The reasons for this change are easily explained. Latin was the language of the Church, and had ceased to be the language commonly spoken. It was necessary to establish schools in the monasteries in order to instruct novices in the elements of Latin. The tendency was to confine the instruction to those who devoted themselves to the monastic profession. But this tendency was counteracted by the necessity of having parish priests who knew enough Latin to read the church services. The monastic schools were almost the only places in which such an education could be secured. The church councils were active in providing for such instruction. Boniface exerted himself to institute schools in the Frankish kingdom. He had himself been a teacher, and had written text-books. As he found the monks and nuns unfit to give instruction, he summoned teachers from England, his old home. This importation of teachers is especially important, because in England, as we learn from the Venerable Bede, a more liberal idea of education and of the use of the classics had prevailed.[1] Yet it is worthy of attention that Boniface in his letters shows no trace of interest in, or special knowledge of, the classics.[2]

Even more influential for the general cause of education was the external pressure which was occasionally applied to the monasteries. Charles the Great and Otto the Great labored strenuously to make the monasteries centres of culture. The convents were obliged to establish "public schools," *i. e.*, schools in which the seven liberals arts were taught, in distinction from the monastic schools which taught only the rudiments. Charles and Otto insisted too that the monasteries should receive pupils who did not intend to en-

[1] See quotation in Gratian: *Decretum* xxxvii., which also contains other important passages.

[2] S. Bonifat., Ep., 23, 64, 84, 99, in Jaffé: *Bibl. rerum germ.*, iii., 84, 183, 231, 248. *Willibaldi Vita S. Bonif.*, c. 2, 6, ibid., 435, 454. Othloni *Vita S. Bonif.*, *ibid.*, 490.

ter the Church. To their influence is due the liberal education of some of the nobility. But the monasteries usually disliked to give such instruction, and when Charles was succeeded by Louis the Pius, we find that some convents sank back at once into the old ruts, and that a less liberal policy in general was pursued. But for the reasons given, the monasteries had become the centres of education and were to continue such during the whole of our period.

As this was the case, it was especially fortunate that the Middle Ages inherited the school methods and text-books from the Romans.[1] Grammar, which formed the basis of all instruction, was interpreted in accordance with the Roman definition, and the text-books were those written by Donatus, Priscian, and other Roman authors, in which the rules were illustrated by classical examples. The reverence for authority was too great, and the ingenuity too slight to make a change possible. Consequently, the classics retained their place in the educational system, and were read, copied, and taught. It was not without opposition; and of some attempts to do without them I shall speak later.

The churchmen were much divided as to the extent to which the study might be carried. They had inherited the opposition based upon the fact that the classics were pagan. And in the Middle Ages there were additional grounds for opposition; the classics were pervaded by a spirit of beauty which led to æsthetic gratification, a sensual sin in the eyes of the ascetic. The classics too were full of a republican spirit, which was wholly antagonistic to the mediæval system. We need only recall the attempts at republican revivals in Rome to see how real a danger to the supremacy of the Church this was. Lastly there was much in the classics which was considered unfit for a Christian to read. Even friends of the classics felt this difficulty. Anselm of Bec recommended the careful study of Virgil and other pagan authorities, *exceptis his in quibus aliqua turpitudo sonat.*[2]

[1] Syn. Nivhingana, A.D., 774, M. G. LL., iii., 451–52.

[2] Anselm, Ep., i., 55, in Migne, clviii., 1124. This is the Anselm who was afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.

In spite of all these reasons for opposition, the classics were recognized by liberal churchmen as furnishing the best means of education. They never lacked lovers and apologists. Lievin, the Irish apostle to Belgium in the seventh century, invoked the muses and boasted that he had drunk from the Castalian spring.[1] Rabanus Maurus argued for the necessity of studying grammar, although he considered the Holy Scriptures the foundation on which all learning should be based.[2] He borrows his forcible argument in part from St. Augustine. He uses the simile of the Israelites and their pagan wives, but adds that in this study we must be careful not to scandalize the weak.[3] Rigbod, a contemporary of Rabanus Maurus, knew his Virgil better than the Gospels.[4] Servatus Lupus compared different manuscripts of Virgil or Cicero in order to determine the correct reading for a single phrase.[5] In these men we see the effect of the impulse to education given by Charles the Great. Under the influence of Otto the Great, some of the leading monasteries became real centres of culture. At St. Gall in the latter half of the tenth century lectures were given on Cicero, Quintilian, Horace, Terence, Juvenal, Persius, Ovid, and Sophocles.[6] At Gandersheim and Quedlinburg in the convent schools, maidens of noble birth were forced against their will to study the classics.[7] Under Archbishop Bruno at Cologne the classics were transcribed diligently.[8] A little later the classics flourished at Paderborn under Bishop Meinwerk. Halinard, who was made Archbishop of Lyons in 1046, read

[1] Livinus: *Ep. ad Florbertum*, in Migne, lxxxvii., 346.

[2] Rabanus Maurus: *De Cleric. Institut.*, iii., 2, in Migne, cvii., 379.

[3] *Ibid.*, iii., 18; *Ibid.*, 395, 396.

[4] Alcuin, Ep., 216, in Jaffé: *op. cit.*, vi, 714.

[5] Serv. Lupus, Ep., 34, 69; Migne, cxix., 500, 532. See also other letters, especially the first, *ibid.*, page 431.

[6] Ekkehard: *Chron. passim.*

[7] Cp. Gregorovius: *Rome in the Middle Ages*, iii., 507.

[8] *Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis*, M. G. SS., iv., 254, *ff.* Copying manuscripts was considered an especially pious work. Many of the monastic rules made provision for it. For miracles to prove its value, see Ordericus Vitalis, lib., iii. (ed. Le Prevost), vol. ii., p. 49, 50, and Caes. Heisterbach, xii., 47 (ed. Strange), vol. ii., p. 354.

ancient philosophy for recreation.[1] Hermannus Contractus, the noted chronicler, on his death-bed wished to read again the *Hortensius* of Cicero.[2] Examples might be greatly increased, but this last one is especially significant, because here we find a man constant unto death in his love for the classics.

Usually a change came over the spirit of the most enthusiastic as they advanced in age, and began to give more thought to things beyond the grave. Alcuin is the most noted example. He had done all in his power to further the study of the classics. He had written in his grammar that churchmen must study the classics constantly in youth until able to study the Scriptures.[3] In his own youth, he, like St. Augustine, had been more moved by the tears of Dido than by the Psalms of David. He had been one of the most influential members of the academy of Charles the Great, and had borne the name of Flaccus. In his old age, when he had become the head of a monastery, he said to his monks that "the religious poets ought to satisfy you, it is not necessary to contaminate yourselves by the wanton fluency of Virgil," and he forbade the reading or copying of pagan authors.[4] This change of heart was common. Otloh of Freising, who wrote a life of St. Boniface, had loved the classics in his youth, but turned against them in his old age. "The friends of worldly wisdom may keep their Cicero, but we on the contrary will follow Christ, who chose not the learned, but fishermen for his disciples."[5] Arnold of St.

[1] *Chron. S. Benigni Divionensis.* D'Achéry: *Spicilegium*, ii., 392.

[2] *Bertholdi Annales*, A.D. 1054, in M. G. SS., v., 268. He incurred great danger by this wish, for Gozo, because of his love for Virgil, was tortured after his death by Turnus and Æneas. Vita Popponis, c. 32, M. G. SS., xi., 314. Poppo was seen by Bruno undergoing judgment and almost excluded from heaven because of his study of philosophy. He was saved only through the intercession of St. Paul, Thietmar, ii., 10., M. G. SS., iii., 748. A monk of Liège, for reading Terence with his pupils, was afterwards corrected by St. Lawrence himself. Pez: *Thesaurus*, iv., 3, 85.

[3] Alcuini, *Gramm. Opera*, ed. Froben, ii., 1, 268.

[4] *Vita Alcuini*, c. 10. Jaffé? *op. cit.*, vi., 24.

[5] *Vita S. Bonifatii*, Jaffé, iii., 483. Otloh wrote a *liber proverbiorum* in the hope of supplanting among Christian readers the Fables of Avian and the Proverbs of Cato.

Emmeram, tells of his change of heart and adds, "Then I first began to perceive what a difference there is between God and Belial."[1] "St. Gervin read the heathen authors eagerly, but was rescued from such studies. His biographer, Harinulf, praises him for this but adds that inasmuch as he had studied the pagan classics somewhat, it was easier for him to renounce them, and also easier for him to understand spiritual matters.[2] This idea of the utility of such studies was the prevailing one. Not to weary you with further examples of a tendency which must be familiar to all who have read mediæval literature, I will call attention only to the most striking, Peter Damiani. From his general character we should expect to find him opposing the classics, but he said, "To study the poets and philosophers for the purpose of rendering the wit more keen and better fitted to penetrate the mysteries of the Divine Word, is to spoil the Egyptians of their treasures in order to build a tabernacle for God."[3]

The utility of the classics was so clearly recognized that it was impossible to discard them. But the old feeling of entire opposition had not wholly disappeared. It was always present in the minds of the stricter churchmen, and there are striking examples in each century. To go back to the seventh century, St. Ouen said, "What need have we of Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle? Of what importance to us are the songs of Homer, Virgil, Menander, those rascally poets? Of what use to the Christian family are Sallust, Herodotus, Titus Livius, those pagan historians?"[4] I quote this early example, because it is so similar in tone to the bold avowal of the papal Curia in the tenth century: "The representatives of St. Peter and his disciples will not have Plato, Virgil or Terence as their masters, or the rest of the philosophic cattle, who like the birds of the air, soar in haughty flight, like the fishes of the sea disappear in

[1] *Arnoldus de S. Emmerammo*, M. G. SS., iv., 546.

[2] *Chronicon Harinulfi*, lib. iv., c. 13. D'Achéry: *Spicileg.*, ii., 338.

[3] P. Damiani: *Opuscula*, xxxii., c. 9. Migne, cxlv., 560. But cp. also *Opusc.*, xiii., c. 11, *ibid.*, 306.

[4] *Vita S. Eligii, Prologus Audœni.* D'Achéry: *Spicileg*, ii., 77.

the deep, and like sheep graze on the earth step by step; and therefore you say that those who are not fed with such poetry should never be invested even with the rank of a door-keeper. We tell you, however, that this assertion is a lie. Peter knew nothing of these things and he was appointed door-keeper of heaven, and the Lord himself said to him, 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' His representatives and disciples are accordingly instructed in apostolic and evangelical teaching. They are not, however, adorned with the parade of eloquence, but with the sense and understanding of the Word. It is written that God chooses the simple of the world to put to shame the mighty, and from the beginning of the world, God has not chosen philosophers and orators, but the illiterate and unlearned." [1]

Cluny was the centre of such opposition, as we would naturally expect from the nature of its influence. Abbot Odo compared Virgil to a beautiful vase full of ugly adders.[2] Abbot Majolus would not allow Virgil to be read in the schools.[3] But later the classics crept into Cluny, as we learn from its customs. If a monk during the hours of silence wished a book, he made a motion as if turning over the leaves. If, however, he wished a pagan book, he scratched behind his ear as a dog does.[4] Lanfranc of Bec discouraged not only the abuse but even the use of the classics. In fact, during the Investiture strife, those who belonged to the Emperor's party were inclined to favor the study of the classics, and those who favored the Pope were inclined to condemn such study. The question took on a political character which is intensely interesting, but which we cannot here discuss. The utterances of some partisans of Gregory VII. may be attributed to this cause. Two of them in 1076 congratulated a certain Bernard, "who, to the great profit of his soul, and of his hearers, had discarded the sportive

[1] M. G. SS., v., 686.
[2] Wattenbach: *Geschichtsquellen*, vi. Aufl., i., 325.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] Migne, cxlix., 643.

lyre of Horace for the mystic harp of David." It was soon to become a proverb, "*Tanto melior grammaticus tanto pejor theologus.*" [1]

Those who were thus opposed tried to displace the classics by substituting new text-books. There was felt to be a lack in the grammars of Donatus or Priscian. God was not mentioned in them. Smaragdus wrote a grammar in which the examples were taken from the Vulgate.[2] Alcuin, Bede, and others also wrote grammars by which they hoped to supersede Donatus. Notker of St. Gall used Alcuin's, which he said far surpassed all pagan grammars. For examples of metre he recommended the "*prudentissimus Prudentius*," and said, "*Non sunt tibi necessariæ gentilium fabulæ.*[3] Possibly the best known example of this tendency is Roswitha, who wrote her comedies in the hope of supplanting Terence among Christian readers.[4] It is indicative of the failure of this and all similar efforts that we have only a single manuscript of the plays of "the well-known mouthpiece of Gandersheim," as she styled herself, while Terence continued to be widely read. More striking is the attempt to substitute new formulæ in place of the classic ones, as, for instance, the monk in the tenth century who asked inspiration of God, "who had made Balaam's ass to speak." [5]

This puritanical tendency could not succeed. Latin was too necessary, and the classics were too useful to be discarded. They were copied, read, and quoted constantly. They were used to furnish maxims and stories for sermons, for fortune-telling, and to testify to the truths of Christi-

[1] Abbot William makes bitter complaint that a monk is supposed to devote himself only to his Psalter. Wilhelmi abt. Hirsaug. *Præf. in Astronomica.* Pez.: *Thesaurus*, vi., 1, 261.

[2] *Prolog. tract. in part. Donati*, in Keil: *De Quibusdam Grammaticis*, etc., p. 20.

[3] *Notkeri Balbuli liber de interpret. Scripturæ*, c., 7, in Pez.: *Thesaurus*, i., 9. Prudentius was the favorite Christian author, and was styled *dissertissimus et christianissimus poeta*. M. G. Poet. lat., i., 543, n. 2.

[4] For Roswitha, cp. Eckenstein, *Woman under Monasticism*, p. 160, *ff.*

[5] Cp. the invocation in Milton's *Paradise Lost.*

anity.[1] Their pre-eminence in education was not shaken until new interests arose, which turned the minds of men away from the study of grammar.

Leaving aside the more ascetic churchmen who were entirely opposed to the classics, I think the view held generally by the Church can be best summarized by quoting Gratian's conclusions.[2] He wrote soon after the end of the period which I have been discussing, and he used no authorities later than the eleventh century. He says: "From all of these statements we may gather that erudition in secular literature is not to be sought by churchmen. But as we learn from the examples of Moses and Daniel, who profi ed by pagan learning, if we find in them the gold of wisdom or the silver of eloquence, we are to turn them to the profit of such learning as leads to salvation." He says again: "Some, delighting in the figments of the poets and the beauty of the words, read secular literature for æsthetic gratification; others read it for instruction, in order to detect the pagan errors which they read, and to use devoutly for the sacred learning whatever is profitable in the pagan wisdom; the latter are to be praised for studying the pagan literature."

[1] The *Timæus* of Plato was valued as furnishing an excellent interpretation of the Trinity and of the procession of the Holy Ghost. It was well known that Virgil in the Fourth Eclogue predicted the coming of Christ. Juvenal furnished so many maxims that he was surnamed "Ethicus."

[2] *Decretum Gratiani*, Dist. xxxvii.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE ROMAN SEE.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE ROMAN SEE.

By Rev. JOSEPH CULLEN AYER, Jr., Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION.

The jurisdiction of the Roman See is, and always has been, a point of controversy, not merely between the adherents of that see and all other Christians, but even among those who look with reverence akin to devotion to the successor of St. Peter. It is not merely a legal question, it is essentially a theological question, and as a doctrine it must be de jure divino. Accordingly, it has been discussed with that acrimony which as from a psychological necessity is characteristic of so many theological disputes. But discussion of the development of the doctrine and practice does not necessarily involve polemics. For a doctrine may be true or false, and to show this is a matter of exegesis and systematic theology, but to show that as finally stated it was the result of a long development is not to touch upon the question of its truth at all. Thus one may ask as to a doctrine closely connected with that we are to discuss, does the teaching of the Church as stated in the Bull, Unam Sanctam, appear in the second or third century as an article of belief required to be held by all Christians as a condition for receiving the sacraments? To show that it does not so appear, is merely to show what nearly every one acknowledges as to almost any doctrine not involved in modern polemics, that in the earliest ages they were not formulated with any great precision, in fact were expressed in forms sometimes afterward regarded as even heretical. Such a doctrine as the appellate jurisdiction may be studied in the same historical

and non-polemical spirit as the doctrines of the atonement, incarnation, grace, or the sacraments.

An examination of the whole history of the doctrine of the appellate jurisdiction of the Roman See would show that in its general outline it bears a very close resemblance to other doctrines more strictly speculative and theological. Thus there is a period in which the doctrine is slowly elaborated by numerous controversies. It is expressed in statements at first quite vague and sometimes inaccurate, which gradually begin to approximate to the final form of statement. Then there follows a second period in which when once accurately stated it is accepted universally as a dogma of the Christian faith, in the sense of an article to be accepted in order to enjoy the privileges of the Church, and from this dogma, universally received, begins as from a new starting point, a premise firmly established, a long chain of theological speculation.

The two periods in the development of a dogma employ different methods. The earlier period is analytical, the later synthetical. The division between the two periods and methods is logically and historically marked by the first formulation of some great principle. Such a principle in the history of the doctrine of the Incarnation and the Trinity is the homoousion, which when once accepted by the Church as truly describing the mysterious relations between the First and Second Persons of the Godhead became the basis of further scientific discussion and investigation, and the Council of Nicæa marks the division between the two periods and their respective methods. In the history of the appellate jurisdiction the logical distinction is neither so simple nor so early. *The division must be made not with* the decision of some council of the Church, but with the pontificate of Nicholas I., to be more precise, with the case of Rothad of Soissons [circa 865], and the principle enunciated was the immediate jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff. Before this pontificate, we find a long period of growth, filled with conflicting theological opinions, gradually becoming clearer and firmer, replete with great political and social

movements each of which contributed its share in the great advance in the Church's settled constitution. After that pontificate, all ecclesiastical law was but the natural deductions from positions taken and successfully maintained by Nicholas. For this reason there is a certain appropriateness in treating the period preceding Nicholas by itself and as a whole, in spite of the enormous interval of time between the foundation of the Roman Church and the middle of the ninth century.

To those who admit the appellate jurisdiction of the Roman See, the doctrine is a matter of the utmost significance. It is at the same time one of the bulwarks of the papal supremacy, even of papal infallibility, and also the bulwark of the lowest classes of the Church against the encroachments of an ambitious hierarchy. It is that prerogative of the Cathedra Petri by which the humblest is protected with the might of apostolic authority. For a supremacy that merely controlled all subordinate affairs might indeed be beneficent, but it would always be in danger of degenerating into a despotism; but as in the creed of the Council of Trent, the Roman Church is not merely the mistress, she is the mother of all the churches.

That feature of the development of the doctrine before us upon which especial emphasis should be laid is its intimate connection with the theology of the Church. It has itself a doctrinal aspect which in the course of centuries becomes increasingly clearer. If men believe that the Church is not merely a community of faithful believers, but an institution founded by Jesus Christ, and endowed with supernatural powers; that the sacraments of the Church are not merely badges of Christian faith and fellowship, or touching memorials of the work of a dead Master, *but effectual* means of grace, necessary for the soul's salvation; and further, that these sacraments are valid and effectual means of grace only in that divinely constituted Church and as administered by the lawful ministry of that Church, under certain conditions and according to prescribed forms; then the organization of that Church with all that is essential to

that organization can be no less a doctrinal matter than those dogmas which are more distinctively theological, as the Atonement or the Trinity, and the law of the Church will be an integral part of theology. In distinction from Dogmatics and Ethics, which may be termed Theologia interna, canon law will be Theologia externa.[1]

If the nature of the ecclesiastical constitution has been rightly apprehended, the provisions of the canon law, however intimately they may be connected with conciliar and imperial enactments, will by the more devout churchmen at least be based upon the same divine warrants as the distinctly theological doctrines. What might seem for a time the result of imperial favor, or the claim of some opportunist ecclesiastic, will soon lose the secular and political character, and appear to be founded upon divine institution. Councils may define the Church's faith, or promulgate laws supposed to be in accord with its constitution, but neither doctrine nor law will rest merely upon conciliar action. As a fact, councils have played but a very small part in bringing about the papal supremacy and the doctrine of appellate jurisdiction. For however much the Roman pontiffs might appeal from time to time to the decrees of councils, authentic, false, or garbled, it was really more of an argumentum ad hominem than an appeal to fundamentals, and the claim of ultimate jurisdiction was made and acknowledged centuries before any general council, or indeed any council of importance, ever acknowledged or provided for appeals to the Petrine See.

I.

The course of the development of the appellate jurisdiction of the Roman See till the pontificate of Nicholas I. may, for the sake of convenience, be divided into three periods: the first, comprising the ante-Nicene age of the Church; the second, from the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the empire till the pontificate of Leo I. and the fall of the Western empire; the third, till the pon-

[1] *Cf.* Rosshirt *Gesch. des Kirchenrechts*, p. 13.

tificate of Nicholas I. In the first period, the Church develops its constitution freely; in the second, its course is influenced by its relations to the state; in the third, it is again free and active, filled with the power and will which is always apparent in a missionary church.

In the first, or ante-Nicene, period there are two main factors in the development: first, the consciousness of the Roman Church of having the care and oversight of the other churches of the empire, with the recognition by the Church of an especial apostolic authority pertaining to the Roman Church; and secondly, the rise of the episcopate in the contest with heresy and the consequent consolidation of the Christian Church. While it is no part of the present task to enumerate the causes that lead to the authority of the Roman See, but rather to point out how that authority came to be recognized, yet it should not be forgotten that causes other than those connected with the Petrine claims were in no small degree effective. Among others, the importance of the fall of Jerusalem and the consequent loss of influence of that Church must not be overlooked. Under these circumstances a new centre of Christianity could easily come into prominence, and whatever authority men might have been accustomed to attribute to the mother Church of Jerusalem would easily be transferred to Rome, the largest, wealthiest, and in every way most important Church of the empire.[1]

I. In the first three centuries of the Christian Church, one neither expects nor finds any elaborated system of ecclesiastical law, though the polity of the Church on the whole did not lag behind the dogmatics of the same period. It was entirely out of the question, in the midst of fiery persecutions, when an outbreak of heathen fury might be expected at almost any moment, to draw up rules for the guidance of the Church in the conduct of ecclesiastical trials, and it was this argument, among others, which overthrew the pseudo-Isidore. But even as far back as the first century we find St. Clement, or rather the Roman Church by its

[1] *Cf.* Gfrörer *Kirchengeschichte*, i., 253

spokesman St. Clement, exercising a species of oversight over the Church of Corinth. In the first epistle bearing the name of St. Clement, the Church at Corinth is rebuked for its recent schism. Apostolic fervor is mingled with loving entreaty and earnest exhortation. In the concluding chapters,[1] as supplied by the Bryennios manuscript, not only are the Corinthians rebuked, but two special messengers are sent to Corinth to see that obedience is rendered to the commands of the Roman Church, which are also divine commands, and they are to bring back word when the quarrelsome Christians have laid aside their strife. If dated a few hundred years later, perhaps this epistle might almost with justice be called a decretal or constitution, and the messengers regarded as legates.

Attempts have been made to use this letter of the Roman Church in the interest of modern infallibleism, and also on the other hand to empty it of all significance as to the position of the Roman Church. But in the first place, it is not the act of the Roman bishop, but the Roman Church. There was reason enough why the Roman Church should take such an energetic stand in the matter. The bishop, however, was still a person of comparatively little importance at Rome. In the second place, it was just out of such acts as this that the position of the Roman Church as supreme arbiter of the whole Church grew. It might be urged that this letter of Clement was but a part of a well-established practice, handed down from apostolic time and universal in the Church, by which bishops of the more prominent sees, either in their own name or the name of their respective churches, wrote in a very authoritative style to other churches, *e. g.*, Ignatius of Antioch, or Polycarp, or Dionysius of Corinth [*cf.* Eusebius, H. E., iv., 23, and v., 23]. Granted there was such a custom, in the early age most certainly the authority of the letter, except in unusual instances, would depend upon the authority of the Church from which it came. And what Church could compete with the Roman Church? This epistle of the Roman Church

[1] *cc.* 59, 62, 63.

was regarded by the Corinthians as almost on a level with Holy Scripture. Another epistle, some seventy-five years later, written by Soter of Rome, was regarded as of sufficient authority to be read in the divine services [Eusebius, H. E., *l. c.*].

In the case of Clement's epistle we have perhaps very little consciousness of legal authority. It is brotherly love and apostolic ferver. If the words of the epistle might almost be duplicated by those of Ignatius, it matters little, for it is a characteristic of ecclesiastical authority that even its more despotic acts are, in the minds of the hierarchy at least, acts of benevolence, the love that corrects for the good of the erring. It is from overlooking this little point that so many false motives have been attributed to the early Roman hierarchy and the importance of early documents minimized for the sake of some hypothesis.[1] The concern for the well-being of the more distant churches, which seems so fraternal in the first century, must inevitably become increasingly authoritative as the very simple confederation of churches became more and more closely compacted and highly organized, and the natural influence of the church of the capital was more widely and uniformly felt.

That the action of the Roman Church and the letter written by Clement was not a solitary survival of the apostolic age and spirit, is clear from the few indications we have of the life of the second century. Among the scanty memorials of that troubled period the Shepherd of Hermas reveals a solicitude for the other Churches. Clement was to receive one of the two accounts of the visions [Pastor. Hermas. I. vis. ii. c. 4] and to send it to the Churches at a distance. We find Soter [Eusebius, H. E., *l. c.*] acting in the spirit of the Roman Church of St. Clement's time. By the end of the second century the authority of the Roman Church had advanced very far, which can be explained, not merely by the natural expansion of the earlier religious community,

[1] Langen, *Geschichte d. Römischen Kirche*, i., 89, endeavors to minimize the authoritative character of this letter from the Roman to the Corinthian Church.

but by the general claim to an authoritative position in relation to the whole Church. To no other of the great churches was the same or even proportional authority attributed, but no other church had put forth the same claims.

In recognizing this authority as resting in the Roman Church, the Christian Church as a whole followed unconsciously the guidance of that maxim of the civil law, according to which in cases of doubt the usage of the city of Rome was to be followed.[1] How far this was the basis of the custom in matters ecclesiastical may be difficult to determine. One thing is clear and that is that there would be a tendency to refer to Rome in legal matters, which covered both doctrine and discipline, and of the recognition of the Roman custom as a norm for the whole Church there is abundant evidence. Thus we gather from even Ignatius and his Epistle to the Romans, that he believed that the Roman Church was founded by, or at least stood in some special relation to, SS. Peter and Paul, and that that Church stood toward the whole body of Christians as a teacher, and in a certain sense presided over the other Churches.[2] Though one might not yet describe the constitution of the Christian Church as a confederation under the presidency of the Roman Church, yet it was in the course of a few years that such a constitution became a reality. Dionysius of Corinth before many decades had passed could refer to the fostering care which the Roman Church bestowed upon the weaker Churches everywhere, but even Ignatius knew of its protection when he besought the Christians of the capital not to keep him from the lions. These two factors, the apostolicity and the benevolence of the Roman Church, went hand in hand during the terrible years of persecution. The Church rent with heresies and schisms might look to one authority

[1] *Digest.*, I. Tit. 3, l. 32. *Cf.* Gieseler, *Church History*, Am. ed., vol. i., p. 382, n. 18.

[2] So Harnack interprets the words of Ignatuis, pointing out the meaning of προκάθηται, by reference to the Epistle to the Trallianswhere it describes the relation of bishops and clergy to the congregation. *Cf.* Dogmengeschichte, i., p. 404, n. 4.

as fixed, or when oppressed by local governments or struggling in poverty might look to one who could act as a mother interceding for the oppressed or ministering to the afflicted.

To such a Church, rich in apostolic tradition and benevolence, as ready to correct the erring as to succor the unfortunate, the various teachers were ready and glad to appeal. If there their views met with acceptance, their future was assured; if there they could find a voice to condemn a heresy disturbing the local Church, they might rest content, assured that the Church would be freed from noxious errors. Thus we find as early as the middle of the second century St. Polycarp in extreme old age resorting to Rome to confer with the Church there upon ecclesiastical matters. Langen [*op. cit.* 146 f.] would make Polycarp come to Rome on the invitation of the Romans in order to have his testimony at but one remove from the apostles themselves, as he was a pupil of St. John. In this way the errors of Marcion might be successfully combated. But of this invitation there is no hint in the authorities, and his success in actually converting numerous heretics is made the cause of his coming.[1] Irenæus clearly makes him come to consult in 'certain points' and among these we find was the Easter question. When, however, it is asserted, as by Langen, that the Easter question was of not sufficient importance at that date to occasion Polycarp's journey, he misses the point of the account of Irenæus, which is that while the two bishops agreed about other things, they could not agree about the date of Easter, and further the date of Easter was within possibly a decade a burning question in Asia Minor and also in Rome itself. It may with justice be assumed that already the venerable bishop had foreseen the dangers from differences of custom.

But not only did the orthodox resort to Rome, heretics of every sort hastened to the central Church of Christendom, seeking recognition of the Christians there. Not indeed for some time does the influence of the bishop become all-important in such matters. It was the authority of the Church,

[1] *Cf.* Eusebius, H. E., v. 16, 17, 24; Irenæus. Haer. III., 3, 4.

not of its bishop, which they sought, and it was not necessary to appeal directly to the bishop. To win adherents among the laity and inferior clergy sufficed in great part. Through them and their influence the bishop might be moved to speak in the name of his flock.

When the conflict with heresy became very dangerous to the existence and purity of the Catholic faith, the Church was very anxious to apply the legal maxims of appeal to some authoritative standard, and while others might have apostolic claims, that Church which rose above all others was the Church of the imperial city, and to it men as different as St. Irenæus and Tertullian turned, pointing to that Church as a truthful and competent witness to apostolic doctrine because founded by the two greatest apostles. Without question both point to Rome as a case of an apostolic Church to which among others men might turn in order to perceive the true teaching. But in doing this they both lay special emphasis upon the authority of Rome, a Church already generally recognized as holding a special relation to the whole Church, hence the greater authority of that Church. It is only when viewed in connection with the indications of the position of Rome to be gathered from the years immediately preceding that the full force of such words as those of Irenæus becomes apparent.

In the famous passage of Irenæus there is certainly some confusion caused possibly by the difficulties of the translation, for the Latin text as it stands on any fair interpretation makes an assertion differing widely from what the context gives as the meaning of Irenæus. The passage runs—"Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, h. e. eos qui sunt undique fideles in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio." It is of no consequence whether *convenire ad aliquem* means resort to any one, gather together to any one, or agree with anyone, the confusion remains the same; for whether the Church must agree with Rome, or go thither to learn the true faith, it remains the same, for the tradition is represented as

preserved from the apostles' time not by the Roman Church, but by the faithful on every side. But the whole passage is open to grave suspicion, and the very controversy over these clauses has been largely due to an indifference to the context. The doctrine of Irenæus is the same as that of Tertullian. It is as clear as daylight. In the apostolic churches the true faith is maintained by the Church as a continuous body. A proof of this continuity is the episcopal succession; and he goes over the list of the Roman bishops from the first who had been appointed by the apostles, Peter and Paul, down to his own time. This would be perfectly useless, indeed foolish, if the faith to which reference is to be made is that preserved by the faithful on all sides, and go to Rome. Something is wrong with the text. Irenæus in this passage contradicts what elsewhere he asserts.[1] To express the meaning of Irenæus as it can easily be gathered the passage ought to mean, "To this church on account of its more important political position it is necessary that the whole Church resort, that is the faithful on every side, and by this (resorting to the apostolic Church) the apostolic faith and tradition is preserved among those who are around [*i. e.* because they always have access to a true teacher of orthodoxy]." Such a meaning is not permitted by the present text, but it expresses the meaning of Irenæus as a whole better than any true translation. It is always a dangerous matter to insist upon a change in a long established reading. But something is wrong, and the objection is raised to any interpretation of the present text even at the risk of being accused of treating the matter from an à priori standpoint.

[1] The actual doctrine of Irenæus is clearly enough seen in such passages as the following "Etsi de aliqua modica questione disceptatio esset, nonne oporteret in antiquissimas recurrere ecclesias, in quibus apostoli conversati sunt, et ab eis de praesenti questione sumere quod certum et liquidum est? (iii. 4, 1). Quid autem, si neque apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis, quibus committebant ecclesias (l.c.). Ubi igitur charismata Domini posita sunt, ibi discere oportet veritatem, apud quos, est ea quae est ab apostolis ecclesiae successio, et id quod est sanum et irreprobabile conversationis et inadulteratum et incorruptibile sermonis constat (iv. 26, 5).

II. The second feature of the period before the council of Nicæa is the rise of the episcopate into the position which it has held ever since. As shown by the epistles of Clement and Dionysius, the Church was made up of a confederation of local Churches; the officers of the Church, however important they might be for the separate Churches, were of comparatively little importance in the Church as a whole. Toward the end of the second century, the episcopate assumes a new character. The Catholic Church found in the highest sacerdotal order a definite authority everywhere available in the conflict with heresy. The errors of false teachers could not be refuted by the creeds formulated at an earlier, almost apostolic, period. Gnostics claimed that their teachings were strictly apostolic. Neither could the Church appeal merely to the New Testament, because the New Testament might be interpreted in an allegorical and gnostic manner, and heretical gospels were brought forward on all sides as of equally apostolic authority as the canonical gospels. Even when an appeal was made to the teaching of apostolic Churches, *i. e.*, Churches founded by apostles, there might be two parties claiming to represent the true Church. This the last appeal could have meaning and force when the true apostolic Church was to be identified by a succession of bishops. It should be borne in mind that the episcopate did not give the authority to the apostolic Churches, but the authority was derived from the fact that apostles left in these particular places their true teaching which had been preserved there. But when it was seen that the episcopate was necessary not merely for the well being, but for the very existence of the Church, and that it was a continuation of the apostolic office, then indeed the episcopal office suddenly became all-important. The Church through the episcopate could draw directly from the original fountain head; it was not merely the testimony of apostolic Church, the apostolate lived on and bore witness to the truth.

How could the Church distinguish between those parts of the Church's teaching pertaining to doctrine and those per-

taining to practice? Victor of Rome certainly felt that no such distinction should be made. If the East differed from Rome on the matter of the date of Easter, it was as serious a matter as a point of faith. (One remembers that the same point was agitated hundreds of years later in England, and the uniformity in the practice was regarded as essential to Christian fellowship.) A few years after Victor, Tertullian [*de Pud.* c. 21] might seek to distinguish between the two spheres of authority, and in the point before him he naturally inclined to the severer practice as opposed to the practice of the Roman bishop. The apostolic doctrine might be vouched for by the apostolic sees and the episcopate, but as to the actual practice, *e. g.*, the question of readmission of certain excommunicated persons, the apostolic authority was not transmitted. Such a distinction, however, could not well be made in a Church which was daily coming to a clearer consciousness of itself as a divine institution for dispensing the means of salvation, and this was certainly the case from the time of Irenæus; and from the time of Origen and Cyprian, it was a commonplace in theology that without the Church there was no salvation (Cyp. Ep. iv., c. 9).

The elevation of the episcopate generally associated with the name of Cyprian was anticipated at Rome by nearly fifty years, as is shown by the accounts we have of Callistus given by Hippolytus [*Philos.* ix., 8], and of Zephyrinus by Tertullian [*de Pud.* c. i. and xxi.]. In Rome the Church was already regarded as bound up with the episcopate, and the office and its authority were transmitted, not from the local Church, a body of faithful existing in all time, but by an actual succession of bishops. The bishops were more than mere witnesses to a tradition in their respective Churches, they were channels of grace exalted far above the Church, answerable to none but God. Not even for mortal sins might they be deposed. Their sacerdotal character was indelible. With Cyprian we only find the corresponding doctrine of the Church more fully developed. The theory of Cyprian that the Church consisted in the bishops was anticipated at Rome by fifty years. Tertullian was already com-

bating it, but about the time of Cyprian it became an axiom of Church polity. But Cyprian's expanded theory of the Church is important rather as giving a clear indication of the tendency of the Church in the middle of the third century, than as describing any actual constitution. There never was in any period of the Church's existence, of which we have any record, any such equality of the episcopate as Cyprian's theory proposes. His own words and practices contradict him. He may indeed formulate it boldly as opposing the Roman claims, but when Rome agrees with him, he is willing enough to recognize the superiority of some one great see, the Roman Church, the chief of the Churches, the source of priestly unity, acknowledging the purity of her doctrine to which other Churches should conform.

The position of the Roman Church, or rather the Roman bishop who had by the middle of the third century inherited the earlier authority of the Church, is clearly enough seen in the case of Marcian of Arles [Cyp. Ep. 66]. The bishops of Gaul had written to Stephen requesting him to assist them, but they had been unsuccessful. The Roman bishop seems to have taken no action. They then turned to Cyprian of Carthage probably with the same reason as they had turned to Stephen, that the edict of a prominent bishop might rid them of their heretical colleague. Cyprian did nothing of himself, but wrote to Stephen exhorting him to excommunicate Marcian, not so much because the Roman bishop had some peculiar authority, for Cyprian speaks to Stephen of "our excommunicating" the heretic, but rather because the Roman bishop could act in the name of the universal episcopate. The interpretation of Peters[1] that we have here the regular and immediate jurisdiction of the successor of Peter over the foreign dioceses, and accordingly over the entire Church, is more than can be vouched for by the facts of the case. Cyprian started from the notion of the unity of the episcopate; the appeal to Cyprian was a recognition of the authority of the episcopate. Cyprian feels that he acts along with Stephen when Stephen excommunicates

[1] *Der heilige Cyprian von Carthago.* Regensburg, 1877, p. 479.

and thereby deposed Marcian. It would not be seemly for a bishop of even such a city as Carthage to act without the head of the episcopate, therefore he acts as it were through Stephen, as does every other orthodox bishop. But the Roman See was constantly increasing in actual importance, and whatever theoretical equality there had been in early years was fast passing away. When a bishop of a city was called upon by such an eminent ecclesiastic to depose a distant bishop not by council even, but by an edict put forth on his own authority, whatever theoretical considerations that might have allowed such a process and still guaranteed an equality of the episcopate must soon give way to a theory attributing superior authority and a real preëminence to that bishop, and such was the case of Rome.

About the same time an appeal was reported from Spain, by which Basilides, a bishop who had been deposed for immoral conduct, sought to be reinstated by the Roman bishop (Cyp. Ep. 67). The same authority which was invoked in Marcian's case, to depose, was now called upon to reverse the action of a provincial synod. Were it not for the clear indications of the rise of such a custom in a later age it might almost be said that we have a case similar even to Rothad's in the ninth century. But there are no proofs of any recognized system of appeals to Rome or elsewhere, and the first recognition of appeals by any council, Sardica, nearly a hundred years later, was so far behind this case of Basilides, that the whole procedure must be explained from Cyprian's standpoint. As yet the relation of the Roman bishop was to the Roman Church, justly regarded as the first in importance in all the world, and faithful to the traditions of Peter and Paul. The authority that belongs to the Roman bishop as the heir of Peter's prerogatives, or the honor due him for Peter's sake, had not yet been recognized by the Church.

In the elevation of the episcopate there was a corresponding change in the position of the bishop of Rome, and the way was prepared for the reception of the doctrine of the Petrine prerogatives, but this could only be by a slower

process. If the Roman Church had held a position, not merely of precedence but of authority among the churches of the empire, when the several churches became subordinate each to its own bishop, and the latter became, not merely an official of a local body of Christians, but pre-eminently the fountain of all ecclesiastical authority and guardian of the faith once delivered to the saints, standing in almost a monarchical relation to his Church, then unless the central authority of Rome be lost entirely, with all its duties and rights, the bishop of that Church must stand to the other bishops in some superior relation. To acquire that position may be the work of centuries, but its beginning was early. It is to the assumption of this lofty position that Tertullian (*de Pud.* c. i.) scornfully alludes when he either attributes to Zephyrinus the claim of being "Pontifex Maximus," *i. e.* bishop of bishops, or else calls him such on account of his supposed arrogance and lofty claims. But it should be remembered that to the same attitude Cyprian alludes in the seventh council of Carthage when he denounces Stephen for setting himself up as a bishop of bishops, and claiming the primacy, thereby compelling other Churches to follow his custom rather than appealing to argument. It is the same Stephen whom the same Cyprian requested to act almost, if not quite, as a "bishop of bishops" would have acted in the case of Marcian, though Cyprian no doubt with his theory of the episcopate saw a vast difference. It is difficult to see how the Roman bishop could have fulfilled what was believed on all sides, in the West at least, to be the duties of his See without becoming in some sense an episcopus episcoporum.

One feature of the Church life which arose in the later half of the ante-Nicene period appeared for a time to be prejudicial to that phase of the Roman authority which encouraged appeals. This was the synodal system, which can be traced as far back as 160–170, and due to the same causes which brought the episcopate to the front—namely, the conflict with heresy. If the episcopate was the apostolic office perpetuated, then though individual bishops

might not speak with full apostolic authority, yet a council of bishops might. Although the inferior clergy and even laymen were often present and even took part in the deliberations of these assemblies, yet the legislative body tended more and more to be composed exclusively of the bishops, and that, too, not as representing their respective Churches, but as representatives of the apostolic office. Then what need would there be for reference to the Roman See in difficult questions of doctrine or practices?

To sum up the results of the first period we find: first, that the superior authority of the apostolic sees was acknowledged on all sides, which authority concerned both doctrine and practice, and of these sees the chief, without any question, was Rome; secondly, the elevation of the episcopate above the Church and its identification with the apostolic office naturally raised the Roman bishop, placed as he was in the chief see, above the other bishops, not merely by his own claim as successor of St. Peter (from circa 200), but in the opinion of the Church, *i. e.* of the West certainly. To these two points but one check seemed of consequence, the synodal system. Such was the result of the Church's controversies during the first three centuries, and such the tendencies of the Church as it entered upon a new era in its career. All, indeed, is indefinite so far as actual legal and constitutional provisions are concerned, but the foundations of a new system, or, as it may be otherwise put, the recognition of the Church's true constitution, which could only be brought to its full realization as the result of a long process, are well and deeply laid.

II.

The establishment of Christianity as the religion of the empire, however much it might improve the prospects of the Church in general, was fraught with danger to the position which the bishop of Rome had attained at the close of the ante-Nicene period. The imperial system was to be the model after which the Church was to be reorganized, and all its parts were to be ordered on a strictly legal basis. The

whole empire which had been divided into prefectures, dioceses, and provinces, was to be duplicated by an ecclesiastical empire, in which as in the civil organization the supreme authority was to be the emperor himself. The senate was to find its counterpart in the general council, though for a time considerable freedom of discussion was permitted at its sessions. It was to be summoned by the emperor, and over its deliberations he presided either in person or by deputy. To its decrees he gave validity by the imperial sanction. In minor matters, the hand of the emperor was no less apparent, for local synods of larger or smaller numbers were to be summoned by him. In fact everything seemed at first to point to such an identification of Church and state that the Roman See would lose all importance, and retain only the dignity always associated with the ancient capital.

But there were several limitations to this system and its full effect.

First, the civil divisions were not exactly duplicated by the ecclesiastical. Although provinces were and had long been practically coterminous in Church and state, only the Eastern prefecture was fully organized. Of the five provinces into which it was divided there were already under the authority of apostolic sees of the first rank, Antioch, Alexandria, and Ephesus; the fourth, Pontus, was already under the metropolitan of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; the fifth was provided for by the elevation of Constantinople to the primacy of the East. But in the prefectures of Illyricum and Gaul there were no sees of the first class and no imperial authority seemed able to elevate any one see to permanent primacy. Only in Italy was there a great see, the apostolic see of Rome, to which the other two Western prefectures of Europe were joined ecclesiastically, at least, by the establishment of vicariates. Thus the whole West remained practically unchanged by the new system. It was not divided, rather the more firmly united and placed in subordination to the Roman bishop.

Secondly, the general councils which in the nature of things might have easily overriden the authority of Rome

as they had the other apostolic sees, were Eastern synods, held in the East, attended almost exclusively by Eastern bishops, and dealt with subjects which for the most part agitated the East. Their decrees were announced to the West by the bishop of Rome, and received thereby an apostolic sanction, even when they had not been brought about by Roman inspiration.

Thirdly, the vacillating policy of the emperors not merely prevented the overthrow of the authority of the Roman Church by the imperial system but actually increased it.

(1) By the elevation of the see of Constantinople, a comparatively recent see, and of no apostolic claim, there was occasioned a constant ground of jealousy for the ancient apostolic sees of the East. The appeals which were made to Constantinople away from the bishops and metropolitans of the various provinces were constant annoyances to the other patriarchs, leading them to seek the aid of Rome in all critical cases, and Rome meant the entire West.

(2) By the despotic and tyrannical acts of the government, either directly or through synods, bishops were elevated and deposed at the whim of the emperor or some favorite at court. The patriarch of Constantinople was of no avail, being merely the creature of the emperor. The result was constant recourse to the only great see removed from the conflict of court factions, to the same see to which men had long been accustomed to look for apostolic judgments. The judgment of the Roman bishop might be withstood by the imperial authority, but for the Church it was the voice of the apostles.

(3) By the favor of the emperors the Roman bishop was placed in an exceptional position. However much the court party and the bishop of Constantinople might strive to raise the rank of the see of the new capital, putting it even on an equality with old Rome, the bishop could never be free from the despotism of the court. As for the Roman bishop, we find Gratian giving Damasus the right of hearing the appeals of bishops who had been condemned. Possibly this right, or rather authority, was given to Damasus personally and for a

special occasion, but all that the Roman bishop received was retained. At Constantinople, each new occupant of the patriarchal see had to win for himself, at the cost of a long struggle, the free exercise of the episcopal office elsewhere conceded as a matter of course.

The opinion may be more than ventured that the actual importance of the council of Sardica has been much exaggerated. In the first place that council was not recognized by the East; then it was for many years unknown to the more distant parts of the West. At an early date even, its canons were mixed up with those of Nicæa. The object for which it has been thought they were passed, the restoration of the deposed Athanasius, was effected neither by the decree of the council nor in the way provided by the canons. The council seems rather to have affirmed, in part, a practice which had become established in connection with the bishop of Rome, and, in part, to provide, by what seems a compromise, a more regular method of procedure. But the effect of this council upon the actual course of the development is exceedingly small. It was not from councils that the Roman See received the right to, or the acknowledgment of its claims of appellate jurisdiction, it was rather built up by numberless precedents, by the actual appeals that had been made when as yet there were no legal grounds for the appeal, by the acquiescence of the Church in those appeals, whereby the right to make and entertain appeals appeared to the mind of the Church as a primitive apostolic ordinance.

The actual course of the development is more clearly connected with the old theory of the apostolic authority of the apostolic sees than with anything else. This in the second period, which now is before us, was most clearly seen in the decretal system, and it was an easy deduction to apply the judgment of the Petrine chair to the settlement of individual cases, when it was acknowledged in the principles governing these cases. If the bishop of Rome was to determine what should be regarded as Catholic belief and usage, he could certainly, as no one else, correct deviations from that belief and usage.

In addition to the decretal system in its simpler form, a second direct cause in the development of a legal system of appeals was the establishment of the vicariates of Arles and Thessalonica. Though the actual system was not continued regularly and was only revived from time to time and finally superseded by the metropolitans, yet there was in the arrangement by which the leading sees in distant provinces were brought into a legal relation of subordination to the Roman bishop a distinct advance toward a constitutional system covering the entire Church, *i. e.* of the West, as opposed to the irregular practice of the earlier period. Although no appeals, in the modern sense at least, were provided in this new system, yet by the provisions of the new order of things the hand of the Roman bishop was more clearly seen, and his judgment regarded as final. The very deficiencies of the scheme would in course of time break through the restraints which the whole arrangement had retained from the naïve conception of law and polity of the first age. The advance in the vicarial system and its successor beyond the decretal system was the application of the authority of Rome to trials in the episcopal and metropolitan courts. The decretals were but answers to questions propounded, the vicarial reference was of legal cases requiring a more authoritative decision on account of the novelty of the case or its importance.

The theoretical basis of these two important institutions was the same. It was more profound than the simple trust of the early years of the third century that the apostolic Churches vouched for the faith, or that by the succession of bishops it was maintained in its purity. It was more than the mere fact that the Roman Church had been founded by Peter and Paul, which had sufficed for the ante-Nicene period. The basal principle assumed a new, or, as might be more conveniently stated, two new forms, the doctrine of the maternity of the Roman Church, and the doctrine of the Petrine prerogatives. Both had appeared as early as the middle of the third century. Cyprian had acknowledged the former, and Zephyrinus seems to have claimed the latter,

but neither came to its full significance until well after the council of Nicæa. The former, the maternity of the Churches, early prepared the way for decretalism, for if from Rome the faith had been spread throughout Spain, Gaul, Italy, Africa, and the islands lying between [*cf.* Ep. Innocent. ad Decent., Mansi, III. 1028], then recourse to the mother Church would be no less than a matter of duty. In the case of the East, of course no such claim could be made with the least shadow of reason, but the East seems to have had very little influence upon the Western mind. The Western Church seems to have gone for the most part upon the old Roman idea that the East was an indefinite somewhere, about which it need not concern itself unless obliged to. Rome was the world, and so long as the immediate vicinity recognized that, it was enough. In the same way during the middle ages, however much the West had dealings with the East, the West went on its own way in its legal and theological development. The Roman Church was the Catholic Church, and as for the great Eastern Church, that was of no real concern—the one true Church was all that needed attention.

While the doctrine of the maternity might be limited by the traditions of the Eastern Churches, the Petrine prerogatives knew no such limitations. The claim to be the mother of churches rested upon historical events, and where it was acknowledged it was the basis of the decretal and vicarial systems, but where history told a different tale it was meaningless. The promise to Peter applied to the whole Church, was bound up with the very constitution of the Church, was a divine appointment. In bringing these claims into prominence, the ground was gradually shifted from the merely apostolic origin of the Roman See, in which Paul and even John figured as well as Peter. John and Paul fell by degrees into the background until Innocent I. (Ep. ad Decent., Mansi III., 1028) even ventured to assert[1] that beside Peter

[1] Præsertim cum sit manifestum, in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam atque Siciliam, et insulas interjacentes, nullum instituisse Ecclesias, nisi eos, quos venerabilis Apostolul Petrus aut ejus successores constituerint

no other apostle had come to the West. By resting all upon Peter, rather than Peter and Paul, the Roman position could no longer be placed beside Antioch or even Corinth, both claiming a double apostolicity. It was as the heir, not of Peter's doctrine but of Peter's privileges, that Rome was to direct the course of the Christian Church. It was no longer as the humble witness to true traditions preserved in the ancient see, but as the proud mistress of the churches that she was to play her great rôle. Though the West, accustomed from early years to look with reverence to the Church in the city of the Cæsars, alone might be induced to recognize the Petrine authority of Rome, yet the East in their appeals rendered enough homage, when interpreted from the Western standpoint, to encourage the early pontiffs in their conception of their office with its rights and duties.

As the natural result of these theories, the custom which had long prevailed of submitting the canons of local councils to the bishops of the more important neighboring sees for their confirmation, was interpreted as a tribute to the Petrine prerogatives, and this submission became less a free act of the council and more the right of the Roman See Without the shadow of a doubt this action concerning canons of local synods arose without any other motives than the very natural intentions of obtaining the additional authority which the approval of important bishops would certainly give, and of expressing in a very real way the Church's sentiment of unity and brotherly love. In this way local synods might obtain more weight. But to what bishop, especially in the West, would these canons be submitted more frequently than the bishop of Rome? He was acknowledged by all to be the greatest ecclesiastic of the Church. His see had from the first been renowned for its orthodoxy. It had been for generations the apostolic norm of doctrine and practice. In this reference of canons there was a species of appeal which in course of time became of

sacerdotes. Aut legant, si in his provinciis alius Apostolorum invenitur, aut legitur docuisse.

increasing importance, for the subjects discussed at the councils were suggested by specific errors in doctrine or practice. With the condemnation of the heresy or the correction of the abuse was involved the punishment of the guilty ecclesiastic. To appeal, the condemned needed but to attract the attention of the Roman bishop to the decrees of the council and induce him to scrutinize the proceedings and findings of the council, in each of which flaws might be discovered.

With the Donatist schism, the Church was forced to see its true character more clearly and to found its unity upon a more substantial basis than sentiment or unity of faith and love. The scheme of Optatus was a prophecy of what was destined to be the prevailing notion. The episcopate could no longer be the bulwark of the Church, for which it had served nearly two hundred years. For at the great council of Carthage [A.D. 411] the Donatists assembled no less than 279 bishops to meet the 286 of the Catholics. The merest accident, humanly speaking, might have given a numerical majority to the schismatics. *So evenly balanced* were the two parties in some parts of the West, that without some higher authority no satisfactory result could ever be reached. The Catholic Church must from henceforth be, not merely the Church of the bishops, but the Church in communion with the centre of Catholic unity, the rock on which the divine Saviour had built his Church, and against which the gates of hell were never to prevail.

It is a characteristic of the history of the Latin Church that it has been able to weather fearful storms, pass safely by the most dangerous reefs, and float over the most treacherous sands. That in this period it met with serious checks can not be denied, but always it was able by a turn in its fortunes to gain its point either in another and more prominent direction or in the same place a little later. Even the case of Apiarus, which has been used by modern controversialists as so important, left no lasting effect upon history. To the Church at large the Africans were simply refusing to obey the lawfully constituted head of the Church, when they forbade appeals across the sea, *i. e.* to Rome.

Such isolated cases are of no more real controversial value than the occasional rebellious acts of English Churchmen in later centuries. The custom was too well established, precedents had built up a law. Zosimus was merely insisting upon what every Churchman would prize for his own case when he instructed the Roman legate to insist first of all upon the right of Apiarus, and indeed of every one, to make appeals, and to threaten Urbanus if he refused to restore Apiarus that he would be summoned to Rome. Such an appeal might be for every one believing himself unjustly treated a great boon, such a high-handed treatment of Urbanus might often enough be no less than an act of justice, when as might from this time on often happen the local bishop was a violent, uncultivated, or prejudiced man. It is curious and at the same time characteristic of the independence of this development of the appellate jurisdiction of the conciliar system, or canons of synods, that the canons to which Zosimus appeals to support his assertions are vastly behind *the extent of his claims.* In fact this is always, it might safely be said, the case. The actual practice was in all ages far ahead of the canonical provisions. Zosimus attempts to argue from the Sardican canons, which he mistakes for the Nicene, when Apiarus was not a bishop but merely a presbyter, and the order prescribed at Sardica was in no respect followed. No canons could justify any such proceeding as that whereby the Africans were commanded to restore the deposed and punish Urbanus if he did not withdraw his censure of his presbyter.

A second phase of the appeals of this second period is brought out in the case of Hilary of Arles, summoned to Rome for deposing in council a bishop of his province. This was even more extreme than the threatened punishment of Urbanus and brings out the new method of procedure. By this an appeal could always be lodged against any judge, on the ground of tyranny or injustice, a process analogous to an appeal of the Roman law whereby the superior magistrate could protect any one from the oppression of the inferior judge.

The outcome of the whole period is found in the position taken firmly by Leo the Great [*cf.* Serm. ii–iv] and confirmed by imperial edict. The Roman pontiff, as the supreme judge of the Church and successor of the Prince of the Apostles, might at any time summon a bishop before him for any offence. Gelasius [*cf.* Baronius, Ann. 393, §§ 13 *ff.*] had declared to the East that an appeal to the chair of Peter was open to the Church Catholic, and that by the canons,[1] Rome was constituted the supreme judge over the whole Church though herself amenable to no earthly tribunal; and from her decrees there was no appeal, her sentence was irreversible and binding upon the whole Church. But Valentinian in the time of Leo, by confirming his claim to summon bishops before him, gave this jurisdiction a reality hitherto lacking. By the imperial edict the summons of the Roman pontiff to appear in his court must be obeyed as a law of the empire.[2] The value of this edict might be greatly diminished by the fall of the empire, but a position was gained for Rome never to be lost. The secular authority might be forgotten, but the system itself was henceforth a recognized part of the Church's constitution. Men might refuse to obey, but they did it at the peril of disobeying what they believed to be the law of the Church, the one means of salvation.

III.

From the pontificate of Leo till that of Nicholas I., the third period of the development of the appellate jurisdiction, there is no definite enactment or change in the policy of the Church and its methods of legal procedure. The decretal system and the system by which Roman sanction was given to the canons of local synods, both of which are legitimate deductions from the premises laid down by Irenæus and

[1] As to what canons, it is no easy matter to say.

[2] In the time of Damasus, the rescript of Gratian had given the right to try bishops to the Roman see, but in this he was not to act apart from his synod. By Valentinian's decree the Roman bishop himself was to act not merely as judge but as lawgiver.

Tertullian, were of course maintained and extended through the codification which the law received from Dionysius Exiguus. What might be called the irregular or direct appeals were constantly being made from the West and even the East so long as the free spirit was not wholly crushed out by the Byzantine despotism. But the steady and healthy growth of the Roman prerogative had always been in the West, and now the Roman Church was girding herself to a great work for the new nations coming within her influence. By a well rounded theological foundation given by Leo to the already well developed polity of the Church, the Roman See was able to advance beyond the ambiguous position held under the empire, and the new nations were to receive the polity as no unessential part of the faith.

Far from being the overthrow of Western Christianity, the invasion by the Northern tribes was its great opportunity. The progress of the Church in every respect was constant from the fall of the Western empire. In the collapse of the imperial authority the Church remained unshaken. More than once before 476 the Pope had been called upon to defend his people, abandoned by the wretched government to the attack of the barbarians. The great advance in the recognition of the authority of the apostolic see dates from the fall of the Western empire, from which the Church issued with all the power acquired by the alliance with the state, but free from the taint of resting upon any secular arm. From henceforth the superabounding prerogative of the prince of the apostles was evident. Already Hilary, Leo's successor, had re-established the papal vicariate in Gaul [*cf.* Baronius, Ann 462, §9]. Leontius of Arles was commanded to hold synods at stated intervals and to investigate any irregularities, with the proviso that the graviores causæ should be referred to the holy see, a matter in line with the decretal system. In his letter to the bishop of Gaul Hilary takes his ground emphatically upon the standpoint of Gelasius: not merely answers to cases proposed to the see of Rome are to be received, but ecclesiastical regulations made by the pope upon his own motion are to be reverently obeyed. In 482

an apostolic legate, Zeno of Seville, was appointed, thus extending the system begun some time before.

With the conversion of the Franks an immediate opportunity seemed presented for the Roman Church to impress its developed polity upon a new people. But Clovis was unwilling to abdicate one half of his authority at the bidding of a religion which even his rude nature enabled him to see was opposed to his ambitious projects. But the course of the Frankish Church was not destined to run smoothly. The clergy were no longer exempt from the civil law, and they looked longingly to an authority which might defend them from what they felt to be an abuse. By degrees the desire took form, appeals were actually made. Thus we find (circa 560) two bishops, Salonius and Sagittarius, who had been deposed by council for grave crimes, appealing to John III. The appeal was allowed, and in a hearing at Rome they were reinstated and the Church accepted the pontifical decree.

But the first great and distinct advance in this period was made in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. Augustine was sent by Rome, and received a commission not unlike that conferred upon the apostolic vicars of Thessalonica and Arles. He was himself always willing to abide by the instructions of his superior, and accustomed to submit questions to the pope for his decretal decision. The type of Christianity he introduced was Roman rather than Gallic, and when in the conflict of the two confessions in England the Roman was victorous, it was not about a matter of faith but of practice. The customs and not merely the faith of Rome must prevail. The final victory was won by the might of the Petrine prerogative, and the constant recourse to the see of the apostolic pontiff was accepted forthwith. Though the British Church had not been entirely destroyed at the Anglo-Saxon invasion, and had taken active part in missions among the heathen invaders, yet it was early felt that the new Christianity of the island was due to Rome, which might for the first time with justice claim the title of Mother of Churches.

But more important than even the results in Britain were the labors of Boniface, who worked under a commission not unlike that of the early vicariates, only binding him more closely to the Roman see (*cf.* Mansi xii. 279 *ff.*). Everywhere his converts were brought under the papal system. Yet there was as before the same uncertainty as to the right and method of appeal, always there was the omission of any provision whereby the condemned might appeal, always it was a reference by the judge of a more difficult case. Only by an appeal whereby the judge was accused to the pope of injustice could the case be brought to the Roman court by the condemned.

In the reorganization of the Church in France by Boniface the same system with all its defects was continued. The crisis was for a time warded off by Charlemagne who no more than Clovis was inclined to permit interference in affairs of his empire. Appeals had never wholly ceased but they had no settled form or authority. But in the breaking up of the empire under the successors of Charlemagne there came the settlement of the whole question. This was effected by the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals.

Without going into any discussion of the Pseudo-Isidore, a subject that has been very fully discussed, the following points should be noticed:—

(1) The legal code then authoritative in the Frankish Church was the Dionysian, which not only included the canons of the general councils and among others those of Sardica, but the decretals from Siricius to Anastasius II. This code had been accepted at the council of Aachen as the code of the Frankish empire.

(2) This code provided for the acceptance of the decretals not only by using them but by including the decretals of Leo (Ep. iv) requiring the acceptance of all the decretals of his predecessors. And though the decretal of Gelasius, de libris recipiendis, was not, it seems, included in the code, it was universally accepted as equally binding with the others.

(3) The practice of appeal to Rome which can be traced

back to the middle of the third century, and which had in one way or another been maintained, was therefore not a new thing, only without clear legal justification and of course without any definite rule of procedure.

When, therefore, Rothad of Soissons appealed to Nicholas of Rome he had in the Pseudo-Isidore a body of decretals justifying his appeal, and exempting him from any tribunal except the papal. And this body of decretals was gladly accepted by the leading ecclesiastics not even excepting Hincmar. It could not have been treated otherwise without violating acknowledged principles, for the question of genuineness was entirely beyond the critical powers of the age. Hincmar seems not to have been fully aware of the provisions of the new code, or possibly was purposely blind to its rulings. When he attempted to combat Nicholas, basing his contention upon the legal aspects of the case, he seemed for the moment entirely successful. Nicholas had for a time no legal standing at all. Canons of councils and decretals of popes did not provide for the case, the refusal of a bishop to be tried by the synod of the province to which he belonged. Scores of precedents might be cited in favor of the competence of such a tribunal. All that Nicholas could do was to fall back upon the Sardican canons in no wise germane, and Hincmar could plead as long as the pope knew no other law, the non-applicability of Sardica. But after 865, when Nicholas seems to have learned the provisions of the Pseudo-Isidore, the whole situation was changed. Henceforth there was open for bishops, at least, an appeal at any stage of the proceedings; indeed the cases of bishops must always be submitted to Rome before any decision could be rendered. The provincial synod could only make a preliminary investigation. The causæ majores, which were formerly the more difficult questions not governed by any clear precedent or legal principle and which the metropolitan had for centuries been accustomed to submit to Rome, suddenly became causæ episcoporum. With this position won by Nicholas, or rather by the Frankish bishops, for the whole movement was due

to their desire to break down the system of metropolitans, the appeal to Rome was grounded forever. It might be long before it could be applied universally, but from 865 on it was in violation of acknowledged law that appeals were hindered or delayed.

HINCMAR: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH OF THE NINTH CENTURY.

HINCMAR: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH IN THE NINTH CENTURY.[1]

By GUY CARLETON LEE,

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

In a consideration of the ninth century we realize that the Frankish world was bound to the old Roman world by more potent ties than those of memory. As we study the so-called superficial continuations of Roman institutions we discover that they are not dead and worthless relics, but living things. They grow even as we examine them. They strike deep roots into the very heart of Frankish institutions.

In the Frankish nation there was a force peculiarly Teutonic. This wrought upon and changed the very nature of the Roman survivals. So powerful was the detrusion, that tribes and peoples, crushed upon each other, were fused and melted together by the very pressure of their impact. Localism was eliminated by the same power that forced extraneous elements into homogeneity with the Teutonic mass.

From this conflict of forces came a new nation, animated by a new spirit, an entirely new spirit through which the world was to be regenerated—the free spirit which reposes on itself—the absolute self-determination of subjectivity. To this self-involved subjectivity, the corresponding objec-

[1] This monograph is a condensation of a somewhat larger work on the same subject.

tivity stands opposed as absolutely alien. The distinction or antithesis which is evolved from these principles is that of church and state.[1]

The intellectual and political movements of the ninth century were to such a degree the natural and almost necessary expression and accompaniment of the adolescence of a great nation, that a parallel is clearly and easily seen between the intellectual attitude of Paschasius Radbertus and others in connection with the controversies concerning the doctrine of transubstantiation and that movement in which the so-called Pseudo-Isidore is so prominently identified.[2]

The metamorphosis of a more or less hazy and ambiguous belief in the real presence of Christ in the heart of a believer into a belief in a real presence in the host was a strict counterpart to the transformation of the moral authority of the universal Christian consciousness into a legal institution.[3] The indefinite, hazy, and ineffectual was obliged by the philosophy of history to become definite and active. One might have been satisfactory for mystic contemplation, the other was needed for real life work.

Under the iron hand of Charles the Great a Frankish empire was created. A sense of Teutonic nationality found expression. The church, too, grew in strength and influence, yet this growth was not normal; it was, if we may speak biologically, a metabolism in the molecular structure, a metensomatosis by which the very nature of the church was changed. The church of Charles the Great was not so much a Roman as a Frankish church. It had by katabolism become a national church, co-existent with the conception of a distinct political entity.[4]

A feeling of self-sufficiency in the spiritual as well as in the temporal affairs of the nation took possession of the Franks.

[1] *Cf.* Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*, p. 354.

[2] *Cf.* Bunsen, C.C.J., *God in History*, vol. iii., c. viii.

[3] *Cf.* Bunsen, *op. cit.*, p. 475.

[4] *Cf.* Caroli Magni, *selecta Capitula ecclesiastica, apud Labbé*, ix., tit. i., cap. i., p. 232. *Ibid.*, c. iii., p. 233. *Headship of King and Queen. Concil. Aquisgr.*, an. 802. Labbé, ix., 265.

The position of the Frankish church was, in the nature of things, abnormal. The development of its individualism had been artificially stimulated. Its growth was, therefore, too rapid for the needs of the times. Withdrawal of stimulus, by the death of Charles the Great, brought arrestment, decay, and an end of self-sufficiency.

The work of Charles was by no means without its permanent influence. Though the detail of his administration did not endure; though his empire was divided, yet the social unity of the Teutonic peoples had been established. This consciousness of social unity found its counterpart in a realization of religious unity.

. . . . . .

The ninth century has given to ecclesiastical history two great names. Yes, more—two personalities, whose importance in the development of the appellate jurisdiction of the Papacy and the centralization of church government is unique in their age. These powerful statesmen and learned churchmen were Nicholas, Bishop of Rome,[1] and Hincmar, Metropolitan of Rheims.[2]

Hincmar was the champion of the national rights of the Gallican church.[3] He strove to strengthen and extend the power and authority, whether executive, legislative or judicial, of the metropolitan sees. He maintained that it belonged, of right, to the metropolitans exclusively, to judge, as a court of the first instance, their suffragan bishops; to call provincial synods and to exercise control over the priests and bishops

[1] *Epistles of Nicholas* I. Mansi, *Conc.* xv., Migne, *Patrologia S. Lat.* v., cxiv., p. 769 *et seq.*; v., cxxix., p. 1011, *et seq.*: *Anastasius Vita. Nicol.*

[2] *Opera omnia juxta editionem Sirmondianam*, 1852, 2 v. (Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, v. 125, 126.)

Duchesne, A., *Hist. Franc. Script.*, v. 2, pp. 414, 456, 475, 484.

D'Achery, J. L., *Spicileg.* v. 3, p. 337.

Bouquet, M., *Rec. Hist. Gaules*, v. 9, p. 254; v. 7, pp. 292, 518; v. 6. p. 252; v. 7, p. 292, 518; v. 9, 254.

Noorden, C. von, *Hinkmar*, Bonn, 1863.

Gess, W. F., *Merkwürdigkeiten aus d. Leben u. d. Schriften Hincmar*, Göttingen, 1806.

[3] *Cf.*, *de Jure Metropolitanorum*; Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, v. 125; also Fleury, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, xi., pp. 331, *et seq.*

of their dioceses, without the intervention or interference, except by law provided, of the Pope.

Such a conception of the rights of the metropolitans led Hincmar to inevitable conflict with the Roman See, for its Bishop, Nicholas I., as the champion of papal rights was bold, aggressive and strong with claims that were bounded by possibilities, not by law.[1]

In considering the change in the church constitution that was consummated in the ninth century, we are obliged to study that remarkable set of documents known as the decretals of Pseudo-Isidore. Their effect upon the policy of the Roman See was profound and lasting.

. . . . . .

The changes produced by the application of the Pseudo-Isidore to the organization of the church may be segregated thus:

I. Those accentuating the papal headship over a universal church.[2]

II. Those by which the power of the metropolitan sees was overthrown.[3]

III. Those by which the suffragan bishops were given greater power and placed in direct connection wtih Rome.[4]

. . . . . .

In discussing the change which occurred in the ninth century in the constitution of the church, it is imperative that we correctly conceive the status of the Papacy at the period in which the change took place. From such knowledge we may deduce the extent of papal jurisdiction over the ecclesi-

[1] "No branch of the papal theocratic monarchy, whether in relation to spiritual matters or not, could unfold itself at any later period, which had not been already contained in the idea of the papacy as apprehended by Nicholas." Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church.* Eng. Trans., iii., 361 *Cf*; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, Bk. 5, c. 4; Plank, *Geschichte des Pabstthums von der Mitte des neunten Jahrhunderts, an*, 1, 35–147.

[2] Consequent on II and III post. *Cf.*, *Capitula Hadriani*, lxxii; Labbé, viii., 606.

[3] Agobard, *De privilegio et jure sacerdotii*, c. 1; Agobard, *De dispensatione ecclesiasticarum rerum*, c. xv., Pii I, Ep. 1; *Cf.* Zephyrini. Ep. 1.

[4] Urbani I, Ep. § 4; Pontiani, Ep. 1.

astics of the Western world with which we are primarily concerned. In a consideration of the papal states four questions immediately arise:

I. The claim of the Roman See to have been established by St. Peter.

II. The assertion that the Roman bishops are the lineal successors of St. Peter.

III. The unbroken sequence of the apostolic succession.

IV. The supremacy of the Roman See.

With the truth or falsity of the three first questions we are not here concerned. They have furnished the basis of arguments that are not yet closed. Yet these three questions are of vital importance to the examination of our subject, because, whatever may be the ultimate decision regarding their truth or falsity, they were in the ninth century believed throughout Western Christendom. They were part of the fundamentals of the Catholic faith. As such they formed a foundation for the aggrandizement of the Roman See, and with this our enquiry is directly concerned.

In considering the fourth, and to us the most important, question, that of the supremacy of the Roman See . . . we may conclude that the admitted supremacy of the Bishop of Rome was not existent in earliest times, and that it was the result of a gradual though uneven development.

In the history of this development, as well as in the history of the Frankish church, the personality of Boniface[1] has left an indelible impress. To Boniface the Papacy owes a debt of gratitude, for he was the servant of Rome and the faithful extender of its propaganda. By direct papal commission as vicar apostolic, by the pallium and by his oath upon the tomb of the apostles he was bound to the Petrine See.[2]

He reorganized the Austrasian and Neustrian churches.

[1] Cook, *Life of Boniface*, Lond., 1883; Hope, *Boniface*, Lond., 1872; Fischer, C., *Bonifacius*, Leipzig, 1881; Maclear, *Apostles of Western Europe*, Lond., 1869; Pfahler, G., *Bonifacius und seine Zeit*, Heilbronn, 1880; Werner, A., *Bonifacius d. Apostel d. Deutschen*, Leipzig, 1875.

[2] Bonif. *Ep. ed. Serarii*, 118.

Under his direction a stream of ecclesiastical legislation issued from the Frankish synods. To him is to be ascribed the reorganization of the metropolitan sees and the foundation of an effective system by which the national independence was conserved at the same time that the Roman power was extended and strengthened.[1]

In the reorganization of the Frankish church by Boniface, metropolitans were placed under the immediate authority of the Bishop of Rome. From him as a symbol of their authority they were to receive the pallium. The suffragan bishops were compelled to submit to their metropolitans. It was to be the special duty of the metropolitans to watch over the morality of the bishops in their charge. All cases of great importance or difficulty were to be submitted to the Pope, but not by any complainant or in the first instance. All such cases were to go to Rome through regular channels, that is, through the metropolitans who stood between the Pope and the Bishops.[2] This is not the appeal of the Bishop but that of the Metropolitan. It was the principle that had been designed for the Patriarchates.

The Bonifacian Constitutions as embodied in the Canons of the first German Council,[3] gave to the metropolitans, of whom, let us remember, Boniface was one, that which they had up to this time seemed to lack, that is, a positive legal authority.

[1] Boniface, *Epistolæ et Sermones*, Migne, *Patrol.*, T., 89, pp. 593–801; Jaffé, *Monumenta Moguntina; Opera quæ omnia extant omnia*, ed. J. A. Giles, 1844, 2 v. *See also*, Mai, A., *Auctor classic.*, v. 7; Bouquet, M., *Rec. Hist. Gaules*, v. 5; D'Achery, J. L. *Spicilegium*, v. 1; Mencke, J. B., *Script. rerum German.* v. i.; Jaffé, P., *Biblioth. rerum German.*, v. 3; Pertz, *Mon. Ger. Script.*, v. ii.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii., 458. For Vita, see Migne, *Patrol.*, T. 89, p. 603, and Willibald, *Pertz*, ii., 33. See also note 2, p. 235.

[2] Boniface thus expresses himself: "Sic emin ni fallor, omnes Episcopi debent Metropolitano, et ipse Romano Pontifici, si quid de corrigendis populis apud eos impossibile est, notum facere; et sic alieni fierit a sanguine animarum perditarum." *Cf.* Gieseler, ii., 27, n. 7.

[3] Mansi, xii., 365. I wish to note that I cite to Mansi or Labbé as they are nearest to my hand. In case of difference between their statements citation will be made to both and variation noted.

This regular system of ecclesiastical gradation by which priest depended upon bishop, bishop upon metropolitan, and metropolitan upon Pope was from the beginning distasteful to the bishops. The fact that the metropolitan did not differ in spiritual function from the bishop, his subordinate, as the bishop did from the priest, his subordinate, tended to weaken the position of the metropolitan. Many of the bishops resented the intervention of the metropolitan in the hierarchical scale. They resisted his authority as an infringement upon their vested rights. The license to which they had become accustomed had brought them to a condition in which direct control by one who could not fail to know of breaches of discipline opened large possibilities of trouble and punishment. But a large number of bishops against whom a charge of immorality and oppression could not be brought were disposed to look upon the plan as an innovation. It was regarded as having no precedent, as an attack upon time-honored custom that had almost acquired a divine sanction.

As this feeling of antagonism gathered force the bishops became ready to take almost any means to rid themselves of the metropolitan control. The surest method was to appeal directly to the Pope, and thus turn the metropolitan out of his position in the carefully graded hierarchy. This possibility was the radical defect in the plan of Boniface. This very defect was to give to the Petrine See an authority undreamed of by Boniface or Gregory.

For a time, however, the plan of Boniface succeeded, for the majority of the clergy were brought to accept it. This success was largely due to the development of the spirit of nationality. The office of metropolitan was closely allied to the national movement. The metropolitan, in a certain sense, stood for national unity. He was a prince of the church, and the church was divided according to race affiliations. A certain patriotism sprang up, which in ecclesiastical affairs centred in the primate, just as in political affairs it centred in the king.

. . . . . .

As the church gained wealth and power it lost singleness of purpose. It departed from that standard of righteousness set by the early fathers for the church universal. Its greed for temporalities cast it from the high position which was its by right, the position of spiritual monitor of the world. The Popes became the vassals of emperors.[1]

With this subordination of the Papacy came a transfer of its claims to supreme appellate jurisdiction. Though no formal act declared this shifting of power, it nevertheless happened that the Bishop of Rome lost such right as he had, either *de facto* or *de jure*, to final decision in ecclesiastical affairs. Charles the Great was the virtual head of the Western church and the actual head of the Frankish church. The Pope became the adviser and not the judge of the Gallican clergy.[2] With the successors of Charles the Great the dynasty of the Carlings began its downward course. Louis the Mild from the position of the reformer of the clergy[3] became the slave of the hierarchy. The church, under the impetus obtained from Charles, threatened to overwhelm the state and to supplant lay officials with ecclesiastics; to replace the aristocracy of birth with an aristocracy of the tonsure. The bishops, and especially the metropolitan bishops, strove to become masters of France. In the end their ambition led to their defeat and humiliation.

The disorders in the Frankish Empire[4] furnished the Pope an opportunity to advance the power of the Roman See,

[1] *Cf. Astronomius*, c. xxxvii. Einhard, p. 390. Lives of Leo III., Stephen IV., Paschal I., Eugenius II., Gregory IV., Benedict III., in *Anastasius*.

[2] Appeals lay through the Metropolitan not to the Pope but to the Emperor. *Capit. Francofurd*, A.D. 794, c. 4. "Et si aliquid, quod Episcopus metropolitanus non possit corrigere me pacifare, tunc tandem veneant accustores cum accusato cum litteris metropolitani, ut sciamus venitatem rei." *Cf.* Gieseler, *op. cit.* ii., pp. 40, 46. The Emperor presided at Councils. Canons were issued in his name.

[3] See Thegan, *Vit. Lud. Pii.*, cc. xiii., xix.; ap. Pertz, v. ii., pp. 594, 595.; Astron. *Vit. Lud. Pii.*, *ibid.* *Cf. Luden. Gesch. d. Deutsch.*, vol. v., p. 581.

[4] *Annales Bertinani, ad an.*, 830–833. Ap. Pertz., i., p. 423 *et seq.*; Thegan., *Vit. Lud. Pii.*, ap. Pertz, v. ii., pp. 597, 598; *Anom.*, *ibid*, pp. 631–635. Nithard, *ibid.*, p. 652.

and to lower the authority of the national church. For the strife between the warring factions could not be controlled by Louis, and a demand arose for a supreme arbiter, one removed or thought to be removed from the effect of local or factionary influences. No one but the Pope could be considered. Under the opportunity presented by necessity his character of intermediary and advisor changed, slowly but not the less surely, to that of supreme judge in matters ecclesiastical.

The Pope appeared in France [1] not only to act as peacemaker but kingmaker. At the Field of Lies his word overthrew an emperor, for at his instigation the followers of Lewis deserted him and fled to his rebellious sons and their allied clergy.[2]

But the Pope as yet hesitated to take the full advantage of his new position. He was unwilling to depose the emperor whom he had defeated. At his hesitancy the disloyal ecclesiastics, says Pascharius Radbertus, showed him certain documents founded on the authority and given in the hand of his predecessors, by which he was completely assured of his ability to depose the emperor.[3]

Whether through the influence of the documents or for reasons of policy, Gregory declared the emperor deposed.[4] Lewis was imprisoned.[5] He was compelled to do public penance for "imaginary crimes." [6] He was considered by his enemies as an ex-king.

[1] Nithard, Caroli M. Nepotis *Historiæ*, L. i., § iv.; Bouquet, *op. cit.*, vi., p. 69; Thegan, *Vit. Lud. Pii*, xvi., xvii.; Bouquet, vii., pp. 593–594.

[2] Thegan, *De Gest. Lud. Pii. Imp.*, 833, § xlii.; Bouquet, *op. cit.*, vi., p. 81, *et seq.*; *Annal. Bertin.* ad. an. 833.

[3] It has been thought that the presentation of these documents mentioned by Radbertus, *Vit. Walæ*, ii. 16, was the first appearance of the Pseudo-Isidore. This is however pure conjecture. *Cf.* Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, iii., p. 151. Justification of attitude of bishops, Astron. 383, ed. Giuzot. Mansi, xiv., p. 403.

[4] Fleury, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, 48, 40. Agobard, Libel, *ap.* Mansi, xiv., p. 652.

[5] Thegan, 297. *Cf.* Ep. Caroli, *ad. Nich. ap.*, ad an. 867, ap. Mansi, xv.

[6] Louis made several public penances. These had an important effect. By them he humiliated in his own person the monarchical authority, and elevated

The emperor escaped.[1] His friends rallied to his support.[2] He regained his empire.[3] He punished the rebels.[4] Despite his successes Lewis did not venture to set aside the authority of the church, or to seriously question the competency of the acts by which he had been deposed. On the contrary, he sought absolution from the censure of the church, and acknowledged the legality of the process by which he had been deprived of the empire which he had so hardly regained. This course had the inevitable result of elevating the Church above the State; of fostering the imperial spirit which now animated the Bishop of Rome.

Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims,[5] had been a leading spirit in the rebellion against Lewis. To Ebbo the emperor had been given in charge at his deposition. When Lewis was liberated Ebbo fled,[6] with much of the treasure belonging to his Archbishopric, to the Normans.[7] He was captured.[8] Lewis charged him with his crimes.

Ebbo requested to be tried in the absence of the emperor, and his request was granted.[9] He chose as his judges those bishops to whom he had confessed his fault. He was not to appeal from their decision.[10] They declared against him and advised his deposition. Another council was held at Thion-

that of the church before which he abased himself; he gave incentive to dispute the commands of a power which accused itself. He published his humiliation to the world. See Capit. of Attigny, "Confitemur nos in pluribus locis . . . tam in vita quam in doctrina et ministerio neglegentes exstitisse."

[1] *Ann Bertin.* ad an. 834.

[2] Astron., 394.

[3] Thegan., p. 396. Mansi, xiv., 658.

[4] *Ann. Bertin.* ad an. 834.

[5] Ebbo, 775–851. *Apologeticum.* D'Achery, J. L., *Spicilegium*, iii., p. 335. *Confessio; Apologeticum, Narratio depositionis, Pœnaticæ; apud* Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, v. 116, p. 9. See also Bouquet, vii., 277. Duchesne, ii., 34. Migne, *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[6] For his subsequent career see Flodoard, *op. cit.*, ii., 20.

[7] Mansi, xv., 793.

[8] Flodoard, Bouquet, vi., 214 C. D.

[9] In accordance with the African Synod of 407 A.D.

[10] African Synod 407 A.D.

ville,[1] and this upon Ebbo's written confession and abandonment of his see[2] deposed him.[3]

Ebbo was favored by the successor of Lewis, Lothair.[4]

In 840, at a pseudo-synod[5] called by Lothair to Ingelheim, a decree was published[6] which purported to restore Ebbo.[7] Lothair having temporarily conquered Rheims, Ebbo was reinstated.[8] He was soon ejected, for Charles the Bald regained the city. While *de facto* Archbishop—840–841—Ebbo ordained Wulfadus and certain other persons as clerks. This seemingly unimportant though illegal act was destined to have serious consequences.

. . . . . .

In 845 Hincmar had become the most powerful ecclesiastic in France.[9] He was one of the palace clergy[10] and the confidential adviser of Charles the Bald. He was appointed by Charles to the archbishopric of Rheims,[11] and was consecrated

[1] Thegan, Bouquet, vii., 85A.

[2] Hincmar, *de Præd.*, Ed. Sirmondi; Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 127; Mansi, xv., 796. *Annal. Bertin.* ad an. 834; Flodoard, *ap.* Bouquet, vi., 215.

[3] Mansi, xv., 796; Bouquet, vi., 251 *et seq.*

[4] Lothair, 795–855. *Capitularia*, Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 97, p. 371. *Constitutiones*, Bouquet, vi., 265, 405. *Diplomata*, *ibid.*, viii., 365. *Epistolæ ad Leonem IV. Papam*, *ibid.*, vii., pp. 307–318, 565. Agobard, *Chartula ad Lotharium Augustum*, Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 104, p. 319. *Excerpta ex Vit. Sanc. de Lothario, Imp.* Bouquet, vii., 323.

[5] No legal synod was ever held to restore Ebbo, neither was the case ever considered during his lifetime. Hincmar, *Ep. ad Nichol. Papam*, Mansi, xv., 777; Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T., 126; Flodoard, iii., 2.

[6] Edict for restoration of Ebbo published by Lothair at Ingelheim, June 24, 840. Mansi, xiv., 773; *cf.* Flodoard, iii., 20.

[7] Bouquet, vi., 254; vii., 281; D'Achery, *Spicileg.*, vii., 175. Ebbo was never legally restored to the episcopate. For his appeal see Hincmar, *de Præd.*, c. 36, p. 326.

[8] On his return to Rheims, Ebbo caused Lothair's decree to be read publicly in the church, and also made it known to bishops and other important persons. He also read and promulgated a confession of his guilt. See Hincmar, *de Præd.*

[9] For early life of Hincmar see Flodoard, iii., 1.

[10] Migne, *Encycl. Théol. Discipline*, i. *Cf.* iii., 1. *Cf. Hincmar*, Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 126, c. 99–101, for a definition of the position of the palace clergy.

[11] Fleury, *op. cit.*, 47: 28; Flodoard, iii., 10.

May 3, 845.[1] Pope Leo, at the suggestion of the Emperor Lothair,[2] gave Hincmar the great honor of the extraordinary pallium.[3] If Ebbo was lawfully deposed, Hincmar was in an impregnable position; if not, it was hardly tenable. This question was soon to arise.

At the Treaty of Verdun[4] the progress of civil and ecclesiastical imperialism received a check. By the division of the Empire at Verdun, Charles the Bald and Louis the German found themselves at the heads of kingdoms in which a certain amount of homogeneity existed. The attenuated empire of Lothair was neither homogeneous nor powerful.

Hincmar felt himself to be at the head of a national church, with the duty of maintaining the dignity and power of his office. Although the national church was more of a reality than the nation in its civil aspect, although the civil unity was sustained by the ecclesiastical unity, and through the aid of the spiritual organization the king controlled the minds of his lay vassals, yet the national church was not stable; it had inherent weakness. It was doomed to overthrow.

It was Hincmar's fate to lead a lost cause. The church had become an imperial, a universal power, from its very nature intolerant of national distinctions, and it rejected the constitution of Boniface. A metropolitan, in the middle of the ninth century, attempting to carry out the traditional duties of his office, was, from the first, destined to meet defeat. The decretals of Pseudo-Isidore were already in circulation, even if they had not come to the knowledge of the highest authority of the church.

[1] *Exc. ex Hermanni Contracti Chron.* ad an. 844; Bouquet, vii., 232; *Ex brevi Chronico Remensi ap.*, Labbé, i., 359; Bouquet, vii., 271.

[2] *Epis. Lotharii ad Leonem IV Papam; Pro usu Pallii, etc.*, Bouquet, vii., 565.

[3] *Pallium quotidiamum*, Flodoard, iii., 10.

[4] *Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 843. *Cf. Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum Scriptores*, vii.

[5] Charles I. (le chauve), King of France, 823–877. *Capitularia; Epistolæ;* Bouquet, vii., 552, 560, 598. *Diplomata, ibid.*, vi. *Ex Epistola de Ebbonis archiepiscopi Remensis depositione,—apud* Bouquet, vi., 254.

Hincmar, learning of the ordinations made by Ebbo while acting as bishop under the Ingelheim edict, suspended Wulfadus and the clerks.[1] They appealed[2] to a synod[3] held at Soissons in 853.[4]

The clerks had several available lines of defense. They could not only set forth their good faith in receiving orders, but could advance Ebbo's authority to give them, basing their authority on the Ingelheim pseudo-synod and the edict of Lothair reinstating Ebbo. Yet these defenses were not advanced. They based their case upon what seems to have been the Pseudo-Isidore. They claimed that the deposition of Ebbo was illegal, because before trial Ebbo had not been restored to the full enjoyment of his rights and privileges.[5] This was the "exceptio spolii"[6] of the Pseudo-Isidore. Further, that the council deposing Ebbo was illegal because papal legates were not present.[7] These two principles are new. They do not belong to the body of the Canon Law as then received and accepted. They are characteristic of the Pseudo-Isidore. It is indeed at this moment when the change in the church constitution takes tangible form.

The Synod of Soissons, 853,[8] declared the deposition of

[1] Hincmar did not depose the clerks. It was the action of the synod. Mansi, xiv., 985. *Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 853.

[2] Bouquet, vii., 277 *et seq.* Mansi, xiv., 987 *et seq.*

[3] Hincmar, *Epis.*, iii.; Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 126.

[4] Mansi, xiv., 985; Migne, *Encycl. Théol.*, xiv., 894; Bouquet, vii., 277, *et seq.*

[5] See note on *exceptio spolii*, post.

[6] *Cf.* Ep. ii. of Zephyrinus.

[7] See page 244 and note.

[8] For transactions of this synod and their consequences, in regard to Wulfadus *et al*, see *Epistles of Hincmar to Popes Nicholas and Benedict*, Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 126. *Cf.* Flodoard, iii., Mansi, xiv., 977, *et seq.* See also Du Pin whose realistic but possibly prejudiced account is worth reading (Du Pin, *H. E.*, IX. Cent. ch. 4). The decision of the Synod, after the report of the Council of Thionville and an account of the action of Sergius in the matter had been read, was, that Ebbo had not been properly restored and had no right to ordain. This was additional support to the position of Hincmar. It is surprising that no mention was made at Soissons of the acts of the Council of Bourges, which would have been so much to the point.

Ebbo canonical and his acts while officiating as bishop after the Ingelheim edict illegal. It ruled that Ebbo was no longer a bishop when he returned to Rheims, and he could not confer the grace of orders as he did not himself possess them.

The clerks then produced a document purporting to be the signed opinion of several bishops that Ebbo's restitution was canonical.[1] Unfortunately for the clerks six of the nine bishops whose names were appended to the declaration were present at the synod of Soissons. They at once declared both document and signatures to be forgeries. The case of the clerks was ruined. They were not only deposed but excommunicated. The clerks appealed to Rome. Hincmar sought the papal confirmation of the synodical decrees. Leo delayed approval, and replied to the request of Hincmar that he hesitated to confirm the decrees for several important reasons,[2] which may be briefly stated thus:

I. That Papal legates had not been presented at Soissons.

II. That the report of the council had not been properly sent to Rome.

III. That the imperial order for the council had not been sent to Rome with the papers of the synod.

IV. That the clerks had appealed to the Holy See.[3]

In these illogical reasons, which are not based upon precedent, there is at least an intimation of a new order of things. A mere cursory examination demonstrates the fallacy of the reasoning which appears to have prompted them. For example: what had an imperial order to do with a council held under the authority of Charles the Bald? Why should papal legates have been required at the council? Such legates were not usually present, nor is there a precedent for their attendance being required at Soissons. Again, inferior clergy had never possessed the right of appeal to Rome; by what right did they now appeal?

[1] This paper had already been published by Ebbo in his Apology. Mansi, xvi., 775; Flodoard, ii., 26; D'Achery, vii.; Bouquet, vii., 281.

[2] Mansi, xv., 746.

[3] For *Epistles and Decretals of Leo*, see Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 125, 129.

The claims of the Pope plainly indicate a new force at work in the church organization. The reasons given by the Pope seem intended to serve a double purpose: first, to conceal the real reason for refusal, the opposition of the Emperor Lothair,[1] and, second, to advance the claims of the See of Rome to supremacy over all ecclesiastical matters.[2]

Leo died without ratifying the decrees of the Soissons Synod of 853. The new Pope, Benedict III.,[3] not only confirmed them[4] but commended the course taken by Hincmar as showing zeal for the welfare of the church. Not only was the validity of Hincmar's title to the office of Archbishop seemingly settled for all time, but the Pope decreed that no one canonically subject to the see of Rheims should presume to appeal to any other tribunal, "as is conformable to the traditions of the Fathers and the Canons of the church, always excepting the rights of the Bishop of Rome."

To what traditions and canons did Benedict refer, and what did he mean by this clause? Shall we conclude, as Nicholas did years after, that the words signified that Rome might at any time interfere and reverse a judgment given in the Archbishopric of Rheims, although that judgment had been confirmed by herself; or did Benedict mean what Flodoardus[5] asserts in the words: "That pontiff conferred on the same Hincmar the authority of the Apostle Peter and of the Holy Apostolic See, a privilege making it so that no subject of Rheims might with impunity have recourse to, or subject himself to, any authority other than his own."

[1] Mansi, xiv., 746.

[2] The question naturally arises whether the reasons *ascribed* to Leo are based on the Pseudo-Isidore. It seems more probable that the true reason for the refusal of Leo to approve the action of the Synod of Soissons (853) was the opposition of the Emperor, and that the reasons in text would seem to have been put into Leo's mouth by Nicholas, and were not advanced by Leo.

[3] Benedict III., Pope, *Vita*. Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 115. *Notitia historica; Epistolæ; Diploma*, ibid. *Supplementum ad Diplomata*, ibid. T. 113.

[4] The Pope in his confirmation used a phrase that afterwards caused difficulty and was used against Hincmar by Nicholas I.—"Si ita est ut scriptis," etc.—the real meaning of which could hardly be more than, "upon such grounds." Nicholas, however, gave it a strictly conditional turn.

[5] Flodoard, iii., 11.

The meaning of Benedict was somewhere between these extreme views of partisans. It was a condemnation of Ebbo's pretended restoration and the appeal of the clerks to Rome as well as a confirmation of Hincmar's position as Archbishop and Metropolitan, and the Bonifacian system of appeals.

Benedict's successor, Nicholas I., promptly approved his action and for himself confirmed Hincmar's privileges.

The relations between the new Pope and Hincmar, though they began so pleasantly, were destined to become strained. The personalities of the two men accentuated the claims of their official positions. With the pontificate of Nicholas came the beginning of the end of the power of the Metropolitanate. This process is illustrated by a series of controversies between Nicholas and Hincmar growing out of a series of cases that may be called leading cases in Catholic Canonical Law.

The leading cases on the subject of the extension of the jurisdiction and supremacy of the Roman See at this period are those of Wulfadus and other clerks, of Rothadus and of Hincmar of Laon. In these cases, and particularly in the first two, the matter of the deposition of Ebbo, and consequently the question of the validity of Hincmar's title to the Archbishopric of Rheims are the real though hidden questions by which the Pope wished to force a conclusion favorable to the Roman See.

The case of Wulfadus and the other clerks ordained by Ebbo may for the present be set to one side for the confirmation of the acts of the synod of Soissons by Benedict, and the approval by Nicholas temporarily suspended proceedings.

Hincmar ruled his diocese with an iron hand and brooked no opposition. His course was justified by the needs of the times as long as he followed the law or, in the absence of express legislation, did not exceed the general authority of his office. The clergy of all grades needed reformation. The looseness of the times affected the clerks as well as the laity. Hincmar strove to correct the current abuses and to preserve canonical order and discipline. His course was

opposed by many of his suffragans, for they accepted only too gladly the dictum of Nicholas that there was but one grade of bishops, and argued accordingly that the metropolitan was on a parity with suffragan bishops and could not dictate to them. The antagonism of the provincial bishops found expression in the case of Rothadus.[1] Rothadus, Bishop of Soissons, was charged by Hincmar, his metropolitan, with having unjustly deposed[2] a priest of his diocese and refusing to restore him on command of his superior Hincmar, with having refused to remove the priest whom he had installed in the place of him whom he had deposed. This was not all the accusation; Rothadus was further charged with squandering the church revenues, pawning a golden chalice belonging to his church, and selling vessels and ornaments of his church without the consent of either the metropolitan or the bishops of the province or even the steward and clergy of his own church.[3] It was further charged that Rothadus had not lived in a manner becoming to a bishop.[4]

Rothadus had good reason to suspect that the judgment

[1] Some authorities for the case of Rothadus: Ep. Nicholas Nos. 28–44, *ap.* Mansi, xv.; Ep. Hincmar, Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 125, 126. Flodoardus, *op. cit.* iii., 13. Annales Bertiniani, ad an. 862 *et seq.* Libellus Rothadus, Mansi, xv., 681. Consult Fleury, i., cc. 21, 27, 36, 37. Du Pin., *H. E.*, IX. Cent. Baxman, *Die Politik der Päpste*, ii., 25 *et seq.* Gfrörer, *Church History*, iii., 1001 *et seq.* Natalis Alexander, *Historia Ecclesiastica;* Bingen, 1787, xii., 368 *et seq.* Neander, *Church History*, Am. Ed., iii., 358, 361. Gieseler, *op. cit.*, ii., 109, 127, Am. Ed. Milman, *Latin Christianity*, bk. v., c. 4. Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, iii., 252–268. Guizot, *History of Civilization in France*, Bohn's edition, iii., 344 ff. Von Noorden, *Hinkmar, Erzbischof von Rheims:* Bonn, 1863. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirchen von Nicholas bis Gregor*, vii., 1892.

[2] See, Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iv., 245.

[3] This was contrary to the Carthaginian Canon. *Cf.* Hefele, *op. cit.*, i., p. 413.

[4] Back of these accusations was the determination on Hincmar's part to bring his unruly suffragan into obedience. He had already sent him numerous warnings. But the Bishop of Soissons seems to have been too fully imbued with the spirit of the new order of things to obey his metropolitan. Flodoardus mentions a number of warnings which Hincmar had written him. See *op. cit.* iii., 21.

of the council would be against him, and to escape it he appealed to Rome.[1]

This appeal was not only irregular but uncanonical. A case once before a provincial synod should have been settled by it, unless it was removed from it for cause, by mandate from a superior tribunal having jurisdiction. A stay and change of venue was inadmissible, and a stay and appeal was canonically impossible at this stage of the proceedings.[2]

It is true that the Sardican canons allowed an appeal to Rome but not until the bishop had been deposed. Then, and then only, would an appeal lay. Even when an appeal could be taken the case was not given to Rome without important reservations: The Pope was not in person to hear the appellant, nor could the parties be cited to Rome. The case was to be remanded to the Province from which it had come up. Then a new court was to assemble under the presidency of papal legates and the bishop was to be tried *de novo*.

It was upon this ground that Hincmar combated the appeal. He contended that, as the judicial affairs of the church were no longer under the control of the state, and as the Emperor was no longer the ultimate judge of ecclesiastical affairs, the Sardican canons, as they had never been suspended, were in full force, and that the procedure laid down by them was to be followed in all ecclesiastical cases to which they applied.

Pending trial and judgment Rothadus was deprived of his episcopal communion.[3] This action was in harmony with the canon of Carthage.[4] Rothadus seemingly regarded his deprivation lightly. His conduct continued to excite complaint.[5] Hincmar therefore decided to press the

[1] Text of appeal *apud* Baronius, ad an. 863.

[2] It was on this principle that Hincmar took his stand. His position was supported by strong precedents; for example, the case of the Vicariate of Arles, *Cf.* Gieseler, *op. cit.*, i., 391. Zosimus, i. *Ep.* i. ad. *Eps.* Galliæ.

[3] *Annal. Bertin*, ad an. 861. Episcopale privat communione, etc.

[4] *Can.* 10. Coun., Carthage, A.D. 401. *Cf.* Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, ii., 276.

[5] *Ann. Bertin.*, ad an. 862.

case. A council was summoned to Soissons to take action in the matter of the charges against Rothadus.

In 862 a council, upon the citation of the King, was held at the Church of St. Methard, that of Rothadus, at Soissons. Here, notwithstanding his appeal to Rome, Rothadus was tried, convicted, deposed, and condemned to imprisonment in a monastery.[1] The sentence was carried out and another bishop ruled in the see of Rothadus.

Nicholas seized the opportunity given him by the appeal of Rothadus to advance the jurisdiction of Rome. He ordered Hincmar to restore Rothadus to his temporal and spiritual rights,[2] to send him to Rome, and also to send a legate to represent himself. In other words, he ordered the parties when placed in *status quo ante* to appear at Rome and retry the case.

Hincmar seems to have paid little attention to this letter.[3] On the contrary, he wrote to Nicholas asking his confirmation of the action of the council that had condemned Rothadus.

Nicholas, upon seeing his mandate disregarded, was violently enraged. He repeated in no gentle terms his order for the reinstatement of Rothadus and called on Charles the Bald to help him. Neither Charles nor Hincmar moved in the matter.[4]

Rothadus was imprisoned for two years. His friends were the enemies of Hincmar, and this common enmity rendered them steadfast. By their efforts and a turn in political affairs Rothadus was released and obtained permission to go to Rome. Before leaving France he sought to strengthen his position there, and for that purpose wrote letters to several friendly bishops, members of the Soisson Council of

[1] *Cf.* Migne, Dic. des Concil, ii., 850, in *Encyl. Théol.*; *Vita Nic. I. Pap. Anastasius*, Bouquet, vii., 328.

[2] This demand conforms to Gaii P. *Ep. ad. Felicene*, Mansi, i., 1231; *Zephyrini, Ep.* ii., Mansi, i., 732; *Stephani I., Ep.* ii., Mansi, i., p. 889.

[3] It is an open question whether or not it reached him before the council was held at Soissons, 862.

[4] Hincmar went so far as to refuse to read the Pope's letters to the synod or to transmit them to the King.

862, entreating their good offices, and furnishing them with what Rothadus believed to be the strong points of his case.

Hincmar was determined to prevent Rothadus from going *to Rome. He learned of the letters written to the bishops.* He seized the messenger and secured the undelivered epistles. By a perversion of their contents Hincmar declared they were not, as on their face they seemed, and in fact were, a plea for aid. Hincmar, in the most arbitrary manner, pronounced the letters to be a distinct withdrawal of the appeal Rothadus had made to Rome,[1] and further decided that they constituted a selection by Rothadus of the bishops to whom they were addressed as a court of provincial bishops to try his case.

Arguing from this standpoint Hincmar declared Rothadus to have, as Ebbo had done, selected his own judges and that he could not appeal from the self-selected tribunal.

Rothadus protested against this high-handed action of Hincmar. He denied the correctness of the construction put on his letters. He continued to appeal to Rome. Hincmar insisted on a trial before the bishops to whom Rothadus had written. The opposition of Rothadus availed him little, for the astute and wily metropolitan won over the disaffected bishops and gained control of those to whom the letters had been addressed.

The triumph of Hincmar was only a temporary one. The opposition gathered force and again obtained permission for Rothadus to go to Rome ; but he was not, however, relieved from ecclesiastical censure or restored to his episcopal honors or to his temporalities. A committee of the Provincial Council was nominated to accompany Rothadus to Rome. For some cause not clearly explained, yet strongly hinted to be owing to an understanding between Lothair and Nicholas,[2] the deputies of the council were detained at the Italian frontier.[3]

Rothadus, however, made his way to Rome; and the Pope, after a delay of several months in the absence of

[1] See opinion of Nicholas, *Ep.* xlii., Mansi, xv., 639.

[2] *Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 864.

[3] *Ibid.*, 864 ; *Natalis. Alexand.*, xii., 375.

prosecutors as required, though uncanonically, by him, on Christmas day[1] declared the restoration of Rothadus to the episcopate and ordered his reinstatement to the honors and *temporalities of his former see.*

In the sermon delivered when this declaration was made Nicholas asserted that, according to the decretals of his predecessors, a bishop might not be deposed without the consent of the Roman pontiff, and a council could not be called to take any such action without papal authority.[2] The Pope was determined to enforce his decision. Arsenius, Bishop of Orta, the papal legate resident at the court of Charles the Bald, was directed to execute the decree.[3] The prelates of the province of Rheims were ordered, under penalty of excommunication, to receive "the guiltless and injured prelate" into their communion. They were given the option, however, of reviving the proceedings before the pontificial court. The first step in such case must be the placing of Rothadus in the same position spiritually and temporally as he occupied before the late proceedings.

The case of Rothadus afforded a new point of attack against the power of the metropolitan sees. In 862 Nicholas had humbled the two greatest prelates of Germany, Thietgard of Triers and Gunther of Cologne, despite their assertion of co-equal rights with him, and their declaration that a Pope was no greater than a bishop.[4] The defeated and degraded Archbishops were made to feel their position of subordination to the Papacy.

In 862 John, Archbishop of Ravenna, denied the right of the Pope to interfere with diocesan affairs, and defied Nicholas. But John, though he appealed to the Emperor, was forced to implore mercy of Nicholas and to place his see in full submission to Rome.[5]

[1] *Vita Pap. Nic. I. Anast.*, Bouquet, vii., 328.

[2] Mansi, xv.; *Vita Pap., Nic. I.*, Bouquet, vii., 328.

[3] *Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 865.

[4] *Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 862.

[5] Anast., *Vita Nic.*, cited; Aquello, Liber pontificalis sive vitæ pontificum Ravennatum, cum appendice, Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, T. 106, 431. Pertz, *Monumenta; Script. rer. Langobard*, 6–9, 265.

These cases were the outcome of the definite policy by which Nicholas strove to raise the power of the Papal chair and to weaken or crush all opposition to Roman supremacy.

The defeat of the great Archbishops of Cologne, Treves, and Ravenna gave strength to the papal position. It removed obstructions, it prevented opposition. It gave the advantage to the Pope in his struggle with the greatest prelate of the Western Church, Hincmar of Rheims.

The attitude of Nicholas had been aggressive before Rothadus visited Rome, but there seemed no legal basis for papal claims.[1] With the visit of Rothadus a new foundation is given to the arguments of Nicholas. This is furnished by the decretals of Pseudo-Isidore. The first official recognition of these decretals was given in the sermon[2] by which Nicholas proclaimed the restoration of Rothadus. From that time forward their influence was paramount in the policy of the Pope, and this because they gave just that legal support which the claims of the Petrine See had hitherto lacked. They supported the assertions of Nicholas that a bishop could not be legally tried by a provincial synod, that an appeal once made to Rome could not be withdrawn, that the affairs concerning bishops were always the *causæ majores*, and that of these the Pope had exclusive jurisdiction.

Nicholas based these claims on the Pseudo-Isidore. He declared them to rest on decretals of the pontiffs of the Roman Church.[3] These decretals were declared to be authoritative and as such must be obeyed by the bishops. "Indeed to even doubt them was to sin."

The natural objection of provincial authorities to these newly discovered and unauthenticated decretals was foreseen by the Pope, and he anticipated it by the statement that to say the decretals were unknown, was no proof of their in-

[1] *Cf.* the letters of N. to Rudolf of Bourges (Mansi, xv., 382 and 389) belonging to the year 864. In the latter he lays down a principle destructive of all rights of metropolitans: "primates enim, vel patriarchas, nihil privilegii habere præ ceteris episcopis," etc.

[2] Note 2, p. 251, *ante*.

[3] First quotation of the *Decretals* by Nicholas was in 865. *Nich. Pap. Epis. ad universos episcopus Galliæ*, ad an. 865. Mansi, xv., 694 *et seq.*

validity, for local archives did not and could not contain all the records of the church, and the decretals had long been preserved in the Roman Archives.[1] This was false on its face, but it served its purpose.

Having fortified his position, Nicholas sought to execute his decree reinstating Rothadus. Charles the Bald was directed to make plenary restitution to Rothadus, and this of the government as well as the temporal patrimony of Soissons.

On failure to do this, the king and all those who advised, aided, or abetted him were threatened with "the penalty of exclusion from the sacred mysteries and services of the church and expulsion from the communion of the faithful as profane persons and robbers."[2]

The same commands were given to Hincmar, but in terms that were even more insolent than used to the king. Even the justness of the cause of Rothadus would not have justified the arrogance of Nicholas. Stripped of epithet and verbiage the orders to Hincmar directed him to make instant and plenary satisfaction to "the injured and persecuted bishop" or to appear in person at Rome. Hesitation or delay in adopting and following one or the other of these courses was to draw down on the offender suspension from all sacerdotal or episcopal functions. Hincmar neither went to Rome, though he wrote in defense of his course, nor reinstated Rothadus.

Hincmar denied his power to reinstate Rothadus, denied the right of the Bishop of Rome to interfere in the cause, and left the responsibility of reinstating Rothadus to Nicholas.

Despite the refusal of Hincmar and the bishops of the province of Rheims to reinstate and receive Rothadus, "the condemned malefactor," Nicholas arbitrarily did so, and thus without canonical acquittal or condonation.[3]

[1] Mansi, xv., 695: "decretales epistolæ Romanorum pontificum sunt recipiendæ etiamsi non sunt canonum codici compaginatæ."

[2] *Ep. Nich. I. Pap. ad. Car.*, Bouquet, vii., 405.

[3] *S. C. Vita Nich. I. Pap.*, Bouquet, vii., 328. Of this act Hincmar said: "Thus was a criminal solemnly deposed by the unanimous judgment of five provinces of this realm, reinstated by the Pope, not by ordinary canonical rule, but by an extraordinary act of power, in a summary way, without inquiry, and against the consent of his natural judges."

The results of the Rothadus affair were, in the main, two: first, that every case involving a bishop was a major case, and as such was to be referred to Rome; and secondly, that a new kind of appeal "evocatio" was allowed. As to the former, its connection with the hierarchical tendency of the Church was reason enough to expect such a change sooner or later. As to the latter, a new legal code could alone establish it. The Pseudo-Isidore provides for it in several passages, the clearest being, no doubt, that in the epistle attributed to Felix II.[1]

The case of Wulfadus and the other clerks ordained by Ebbo after his deposition had for some years seemed settled, but it was now to be reopened. Nicholas saw the effect of a decision favorable to the clerks upon the position of his opponent Hincmar. He could not fail to see the applicability of the Pseudo-Isidore to the case of Ebbo, and the power these decretals placed in his hands.[2]

Nicholas wished to reopen the case of Wulfadus because he believed himself able to obtain a judgment favorable to those ordained by Ebbo. Such a decision would be a virtual acknowledgment by the Gallican Church of the Pseudo-Isidore, for the case of the clerks rested upon its principles, and would also be a denial of the right of Hincmar to the metropolitanate of Rheims.[3]

Nicholas ordered Hincmar either to restore the clerks or to open their case *de novo* at a synod. This command placed

[1] Ep. i., Canon 16: "Nam in sæcularibus legibus, post quam vocatus quis venerit et in foro decertare cœperit, non licet ei ante peractam causam recedere, in ecclesiasticis vero dicta causa recedere licet, si necesse fuerit aut si se prægravari viderit. . . . si quis autem judicem adversum sibi senserit, vocem appellationis exhibeat, quam nulli oportet negari."

[2] This applicability of the decretals of Pseudo-Isidore to the case of Ebbo has given rise to a strongly sustained hypothesis that Ebbo was the sole or principal collector and fabricator of the Pseudo-Isidore, at least in so far as they concern the trials of bishops. *Cf.* V. Noorden, *Hinkmar*, p. 25 *et seq.*

[3] It should be noted that the claims of Nicholas and his attempt to reopen the case of Ebbo was unsupported by precedent. The current of law from Sardica down had given competent jurisdiction to local synods. Unless the decree of the synod was appealed from (and this was not the case here), it stood valid against the world. *Cf.* Greenwood, *op. cit.*, iii., 272.

Hincmar in a trilemma. He dreaded the synod, for he fathomed the Pope's designs against him. On the other hand he could not restore the clerks, for such an act would be an acknowledgment that Ebbo's deposition was illegal or his restoration legal, and this would cloud Hincmar's own episcopal title. Should he decline to restore the clerks or to reopen the case before a council at the order of the Pope, he would come in direct conflict with the papal authority as defined by Pseudo-Isidore. Hincmar was unable to expose the flaws in the new decretals. He was in no position to defy them.[1] As the least of the three evils the synod was chosen.[2] Here the ability to manage men, that distinguished this greatest of the politicians of the Gallican Church, might help his cause. It did. Hincmar convinced the council:

I. That he could not canonically restore the clerks, for a council, and not he, had deposed them, and further, as two Popes had confirmed the proceedings of the council that did so, the matter was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Rheims.

II. That the council had not met to consider the deposition of Ebbo, as some pretended, but the case of Wulfadus.

Though in this Hincmar was technically correct, yet the deposition of Ebbo was the real point in controversy, not only because Nicholas wished it to be so, but because the case of Wulfadus was dependent upon the validity of Ebbo's title to the archbishopric at the time the clerks were ordained. By accepting Hincmar's opinion the council escaped the discussion of the unpleasant claims of the Pseudo-Isidore.

III. That there was no legal ground upon which he or the council could restore the clerks, but as the Pope was so

[1] The epistle of Leo to the bishops of Campania (Ep. v.) provided for the reception of all previous epistles and decretals: "omnia decretalia constituta, tam beatæ recordationis Innocentii quam omnium decessorum nostrorum quæ de ecclesiasticis ordinibus et canonum promulgata sunt disciplinis, ita vestram dilectionem custodire debere mandamus." As a matter of fact the decretal of Gelasius, de libris recipiendis, not included in the current legal code, was received. *Cf.* Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, 151 ff.

[2] Mansi, xv., 712.

much interested in Wulfadus that he should restore him of his own authority, after the example of the Militian schism in Egypt at the time of the Nicene Council, provided that it was not done to the disadvantage of any member of the synod.[1]

The decisions of the synod did not please Nicholas. He was unable, however, to attack them on legal grounds, and so he endeavored to carry his point by questioning the legal competency of the council in which the clerks had been originally deposed. He alleged that council to be *ab initio* illegal because no papal legates were present; that even if it were legal, that its decrees had never been legally confirmed. He accused Hincmar of fraudulently securing such papal confirmation as had been given, and therefore the confirmation was of no effect.[2]

Nicholas allowed Hincmar one year in which to prove the legality of the council and of its action in the case of Wulfadus and the other clerks. He ordered, as in the case of Rothadus, that *pendente lite* the clerks should be restored to their places.[3]

Nicholas resented the insinuation of the council that the Pope might, as a matter of favor, restore the clerks. The right of restoration was, he said, a right which belonged to the Roman See, and was not dependent upon the resolutions of councils. Then he declared that the contumacy of the Gallican church, and more particularly Hincmar and his supporters in opposing the papal claims, meant that neither Ebbo, Wulfadus, nor the clerks had been lawfully deposed.[4]

Hincmar replied to Nicholas in a long and carefully written epistle. He met the allegations of the discomfited pontiff by citations from the known and accepted Hadriano-

[1] *Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 866.

[2] See p. 245, *supra*.

[3] Here, as in the case of Rothadus, and of Hincmar of Laon, was a direct reference to the *exceptio spolii* of Pseudo-Isidore. The following sentence used by Nicholas is quoted from the Pseudo-Damasius: "Non enim enermis cum annato vite conflictum mire potuit." The demand that the clerks should be reinstated before any action began is based upon *Ep. Zephr.* in Pseudo-Isidore.

[4] Mansi, xv., 738.

Dionysian Code. He argued that the quotations from the Pseudo-Alexander, used by the Pope, did not apply to the case, as the confession of Ebbo had not been extorted by force, fraud, or fear.[1]

Nicholas was determined to crush Hincmar. Though the Council of Soissons (866) had been called by the Pope, its findings, not being satisfactory to him, were rejected. The papal party put forward its utmost efforts during the year following; it strove to win the Gallican prelates, and to strengthen and organize the opposition to Hincmar. As the organization progressed the Pope was fully advised, and when all seemed ready for the attack on Hincmar, he ordered a council to be held at Troyes in the autumn of 867.[2]

At this council the papal party was in the majority. It was bent upon advancing the status of the suffragan bishops and diminishing the power of metropolitans. The case of Ebbo was reopened. Rothadus, formerly the defender of the legality of the proceedings against Ebbo, and a principal witness against the clerks, was now the determined enemy of Hincmar, and stultified himself by reversing his former statement of fact in Ebbo's case. The suffragan bishops, bent on freeing themselves from the control of their metropolitans, appealed to the Pope to see to it that no bishop should be deposed without the consent of the Roman See.

Here was the most determined attack that had confronted Hincmar. It was not an invasion but a rebellion. It was an attempt to overthrow the metropolitan constitution as it had been established by Boniface and received for two centuries by the church.

The astute Metropolitan faced the tumult. He turned defeat into victory. By conceding to his enemies that which, if the Pseudo-Isidore was accepted, no longer be-

[1] Ep. Alex.: "Similiter, si hujusmodo personis queddam scriptoræ quoque modo per metum, aut fraudeno, aut vem extortæ fuerunt." The answer of Hincmar is not a full acceptation of the Pseudo-Isidore. It may, however, be construed as admitting its authenticity.

[2] *Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 867.

longed to his person or office, he placated them. By a wise concession that cost him nothing, and by a fictitious display of reserve power, he induced the council to agree with him on the question of Ebbo's deposition and the case of the clerks.[1]

The findings of the council of 866 had been unsatisfactory to Nicholas; those of the session of 867 were at variance with the views of Charles the Bald. He intercepted the messenger bearing the synodical letter to the Pope. The six archbishops present at Troyes had secured the missive with their seals. Charles broke these and read the letter. He wrote a refutation of the conclusions of the synod, excepting those bearing upon the rights of suffragan bishops, and then sent his letter with that of the synod to Rome.[2]

While the anti-metropolitan party had been gathering strength in France its final victory was to be deferred by defeat; for the Roman See was involved in controversies with the Greek Church that for the moment claimed the undivided attention of Nicholas. He now needed the support of those primates whose power he had been determined to lower. Hincmar was necessary to the defense of Rome.[3]

Even before the council convened at Troyes, Nicholas had written[4] to Hincmar requesting him to bring the other French bishops to the aid of the Petrine See in its struggles with the Greeks. In another letter Nicholas approved the course of Hincmar in the case of Wulfadus.

Unconscious of this turn in affairs, the messenger of the synod bearing his double burden, on which the hopes of Hincmar's antagonists rested, passed the papal courier hurrying northward, and hastened on to Rome. When he arrived Nicholas was dead.[5]

[1] *Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 867.

[2] *Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 867.

[3] Hincmar had also outflanked his adversaries, for six months before the synod of Troyes he had sent agents to the Pope. These in the disguise of pilgrims had evaded the enemies that beset them and reached Rome. They had gained the Pope's ear, and the letters mentioned must, at least in part, be ascribed to their influence. *Cf. Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 867.

[4] Mansi, xv., 355.

[5] Nicholas died less than three weeks after the council of Troyes.

Adrian II.,[1] who succeeded Nicholas, approved the decrees of Troyes (February, 868). He attempted to carry out the policy of Nicholas, but he lacked the far-seeing mind, the iron will, and the consummate ability of his great predecessor. The suffragan bishops aided him to the extent of their ability, but their combined efforts did not suffice to advance the papal prerogative beyond the status to which Nicholas had brought it.

The Bonifacian system was, however, doomed. The new decretals gained ground. They seemed suited to the needs of the times. They were in fact an expression of those needs. It therefore was of little consequence if the Pope was unsuccessful in individual controversies, for the forward movement of the Roman supremacy was to be certain and continued.

The change in the ecclesiastical world was accompanied by convulsions in the secular world. The disintegration of the Empire and the destruction of its institutions was still progressing. The old bases of nationality were no longer stable. Their shifting and interchanging disturbed the existent half-built superstructures which they supported. The power of the metropolitans was no longer firmly grounded upon nationality. It lost the support that had sustained it in the conflicts with the Papacy.

We may illustrate the effect of Pseudo-Isidore upon the church organization by one case, that of Hincmar of Laon,[2] which seemed to combine most of the points in dispute.[3] The points advanced by the Bishop of Laon were, in the main, based upon the Pseudo-Isidore. They were briefly:

(1.) Unlimited right of appeal to Rome on the part of the suffragan bishops.

(2.) Opposition to every privilege pertaining to metropoli-

[1] Adrian II., Pope.—*Epistolæ ap.*, Bouquet, *Rec. Hist.*, Gaules, v. 7. *Epistolæ et decreta*, Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, 122 pp. 129–1015. *Notitia Historica in Adrianum, II.*, Migne, *Ibid.*

[2] Migne, *Patrol.*, T. 126; *Hincmari, opuscula et epistolæ quæ spectant, causam Hincmari Laudunensis, Ibid.*, T. 124. *Epistola Hincmari Laudunensis ad Hincmarum Rhemensem; Annal. Bertin.*, ad an. 868.

[3] I will not here go into a study of its detail, reserving that for later publication.

tans as superior to their suffragans, excepting such metropolitans who were at the same time patriarchs.[1]

(3.) Protest against the interference by metropolitans in the management of their dioceses by suffragans.

(4.) The restitution of an accused bishop to office and goods before he could be summoned before an ecclesiastical court.

(5.) The illegality of every synod not summoned by the Roman See, or at which papal legates were not present.

(6.) The permission to restore a condemned bishop without the concurrence of a full synod.

(7.) Accusations of a bishop to be made more difficult.

(8.) Unconditional acceptance without distinction of all *decretals as law.*[2]

Hincmar of Rheims presented an elaborate refutation of Laon's claims. It is of the utmost importance to our enquiry that we should note the authorities to which Hincmar appealed. It is by the very Pseudo-Isidore on which Laon had so confidently depended that Hincmar refutes him.

Hincmar used Pseudo-Isidore to support his arguments because he was unable to reject that body of decretals. He was obliged to accept the new law.

That Laon was condemned, and Adrian compelled to acknowledge the legality of the deposition that followed is of comparatively small importance in our study. The main point is that Laon's case proved the general acceptance of the Pseudo-Isidore by the Gallican church. It had been accepted, and that too in its entirety, by the metropolitans against whom it made the strongest. By this acceptance a new constitution was given to the church, for whatever rights were seemingly reserved to metropolitans their real power was taken from them. With the acceptance of the new decretals a new era began. The only metropolitan in the true sense, the old sense, of the term was henceforth, by the accepted law of the Western Church, to be the Pope.

[1] This preserved the rights of Rome and overthrew those of Rheims.

[2] *Cf.* Von Noorden, *Hinkmar*, p. 268.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS TOWARD SLAVERY IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES, PARTICULARLY IN RELATION TO ITS OWN MEMBERS.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS TOWARD SLAVERY IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES, PARTICULARLY IN RELATION TO ITS OWN MEMBERS.

By Professor ALLEN CLAPP THOMAS, Haverford College.

(Read in abstract at a meeting of the American Society of Church History, New York, December 30, 1896.)

The Society of Friends took its origin in England, and it is therefore natural that slavery did not attract much attention from its members until some of them emigrated to countries where slavery was an established institution. Like the members of other denominations, these seem to have taken slavery as a matter of course, and some fell into the habit of owning slaves themselves, and when slaveholders joined the society they retained their slaves.[1]

As early as 1657 George Fox, in an epistle "To Friends beyond sea that have Blacks and Indian Slaves," impressed upon those to whom he wrote the truth that God hath made all nations of one blood, implying that negroes were among those to whom the Gospel should be preached.[2]

[1] Some interesting cases occur in Besse's *Sufferings*. In 1675, the sheriff of the island of Nevis, for non-payment of fines and fees, "took from John Carpenter a negro man worth 4,000 pounds of sugar, . . . and also took a negro from John Brown." In 1677, John Carpenter had "a meeting in his own house at which several of his negroes were present." "James Brown the younger for not bearing arms was fined 1900 pounds of sugar, for which a negro of his was taken." In 1678, in Barbadoes, Thomas Parker, "for opening his shop on days superstitiously called Holy-days . . . had a negro man taken." Besse's *Sufferings of the Quakers*, ii., 315, 360, 361.

[2] *Epistles*, Epistle 153.

Fox does not appear to refer to the subject again until the condition of the slaves was brought to his notice when he, with William Edmundson, and others, visted the West Indies in 1671. Then his sympathies were greatly excited on behalf of the slaves. He held meetings with them, encouraged them to practice morality in their social relations, and preached the Gospel to them. On the other hand, he told the slaveholders that they should "deal mildly and gently with their negroes, and not use cruelty towards them, . . . and that after certain years of servitude, they would make them free."[1] On another occasion he wrote:

"And to close up this, let me tell you, it will doubtless be very acceptable to the Lord, if so be that masters of families here would deal so with their servants, the negroes and blacks, whom they have bought with their money, to let them go after a considerable term of years, if they have served them faithfully: and when they go and are made free let them not go away empty handed. . . . And further consider with yourselves, if you were in the same condition as the blacks are, . . . who came as strangers to you, and were sold to you as slaves: now I say, if this should be the condition of you or yours, you would think it hard measure; yea, very great bondage."[2]

This was strange doctrine to preach in the seventeenth century. William Edmundson paid a second visit to Barbadoes in 1675, and was brought before the Governor on the charge of "making the negroes Christians, and that would make them rebel and cut their throats. I told him it was a good work to bring them to a knowledge of God and Christ Jesus, and to believe in him that died for them and all men, and that would keep them from rebelling."[3]

William Edmundson felt very strongly on the subject, for, apparently about this time, he addressed an epistle to Friends in America, in which he speaks of negroes as of "the

[1] *Journal*, p. 354.
[2] *Gospel Family Order*, etc.
[3] *Journal*, p. 75.

same mould" as the whites, and that Christ shed his blood for all men. "Which of you all," says he, "would have the blacks or others to make you their slaves without hope or expectation of freedom or liberty? Would not this be an aggravation upon your minds that would outbalance all other comforts? So make their conditions your own; for a good conscience void of offence is of more worth than all the world, and truth must regulate all wrongs and wrong-dealing."[1]

It may seem a little surprising that Fox and Edmundson do not say more about slavery on the continent of North America, but at the time of Fox's visit (1672) there were comparatively few slaves in the colonies, and probably not many were held by Friends three years later, when Edmundson visited them.

That the preaching of Fox and Edmundson had an effect is shown by the passage of a law in Barbadoes in 1676 "to prevent the people called Quakers from bringing negroes to their meetings," etc., because "the safety of this island may be much hazarded" by the negroes being "suffered to remain at the meetings of the Quakers as hearers of their doctrines and taught in their principles." Negroes found at such meetings were to be forfeited, if they belonged to persons at the meetings, and if not, the informer was to receive £10 for every negro, the fine to be paid by any person present. To prevent the Quakers from teaching the negroes, no person was allowed to teach any children until the oath of allegiance or supremacy be first taken before a Justice of the Peace, or the Governor should issue a special license. As no Quaker would take any oath whatsoever, this was an effectual stop to any instruction by Quakers. The authorities also determined that no more missionaries should come to stir up the Friends, and so passed an edict that no stranger should preach at a Quaker meeting until he had been in the island for twelve months, upon the penalty of six months' imprisonment without bail, and the forfeiture of "ten thousand pound of muscovado sugar." In 1678 an-

[1] *Brief Statement*, etc., p. 7.

other act was passed to prevent Quakers from bringing negroes to their meetings, and in 1680 an order was issued to break up all Quaker meetings, but it does not appear to have been enforced. What between the severe laws against the Quakers, the edicts of banishment, and those forbidding masters of vessels to bring any of the sect into the island, and the influence of slavery itself, it is not surprising that Quakerism died out before very long in the West Indies.[1]

William Penn, in the charter of the "Free Society of Traders of Pennsylvania," recognized slavery, but provided that "black servants" should, under certain conditions, be free after fourteen years of service. Penn himself at one time held slaves, and, through no fault of his own, appears to have died owning two or three old slaves whom he intended to have set free some years before.[2]

The hard condition of the negroes, particularly their moral and religious state, caused him much concern, and he tried to alleviate it in various ways. In 1700, as Proprietor, he brought before the Provincial Council a law for regulating the marriages of negroes, which was lost in the Assembly. In the same year he brought before the Monthly Meeting of Philadelphia what had "lain on his mind for some time concerning the negroes and Indians, that Friends ought to be very careful in discharging a good conscience towards them in all respects, but more especially for the good of their souls, and that they might, as frequent as may be, come to meetings on First Days." Upon consideration of this the meeting concluded "to appoint a meeting for the negroes to be kept once a month, etc., and that their masters give notice thereof in their families, and be present with them at the said meetings as frequent as may be."[3]

Among those who had accepted Penn's invitation to emigrate to America were some Germans from Krisheim, near

[1] Besse, ii., 307 *ff.*

[2] Hazard's *Annals*, 580; Watson's *Annals*, 480; Janney, 194, 436, 438.

[3] Michener, 336; *Memoirs Histor. Soc. of Pa.*, i., 384; Janney, 438.

the Rhine, who had accepted the doctrines of the Society, probably through the preaching of William Ames.[1] Brought up in Germany, where there was no slave-trade, and where slavery was unknown, the sight which greeted them in Pennsylvania of men and women in bondage, must have been repugnant to every fibre of their souls. In 1688, a few of them addressed their Monthly Meeting at Germantown on the subject of slavery.[2]

This address is a very strong presentation of the matter. "There is liberty of conscience here," they say, "which is right and reasonable, and there ought to be likewise liberty of the body, except for evildoers, which is another case. But to bring men hither, or to rob and sell them against their will, we stand against." Again: "This makes an ill report in all those countries of Europe, where they hear of it, that the Quakers do here handle men as they handle there the cattle. Consider . . . if it is done according to Christianity?"[3]

The monthly meeting found the matter so "weighty" that they did not think it expedient for them to meddle with, but referred it to the quarterly meeting. The document was read in that meeting the 4th of 4th month, [June] 1688, and was recommended to the Yearly Meeting, "it being a thing of too great weight for this meeting to determine." The Yearly Meeting made the following minute: "A paper was presented by some German Friends concerning the lawfulness and unlawfulness of buying and keeping negroes. It was adjudged not to be so proper for this meeting to give a positive judgement in the case, it

[1] Sewel, i., 349.

[2] According to the custom of the Society of Friends, each of the Yearly Meetings is, while agreeing on all important matters with other Yearly Meetings, independent in its action. According to the constitution of the Society the Yearly Meeting is the legislative body and the supreme court of appeal; the Quarterly Meetings are next to the Yearly Meeting, and receive instructions from it, and are a primary court of appeal; the Monthly Meetings are the executive branch of the church.

[3] Michener, 332–335; *The Friend* (Phila.), xvii., 125; *Pa. Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, iv., 31. See Appendix i. for document.

having so general relation to many other parts; and therefore they forbear it."[1]

This action of the various meetings may seem very cautious, but it must be remembered that slavery was regarded by the community of that day as perfectly allowable. It is also one of the customs of the Society of Friends rarely, if ever, to press a matter to a conclusion in the face of those who conscientiously object, even if they are comparatively few in number. Questions in a Friends' meeting in the 17th and 18th centuries were never settled by majorities; they are rarely so settled at the close of the 19th century. Of course factious objections were not so treated.

A number of Friends were slaveholders at that time, and such naturally would honestly resist the recognition of the principle set forth by the German Friends. There seems to be little doubt that the petition did have an effect upon individuals.

In 1693 George Keith and his seceding Friends issued a printed appeal entitled "An exhortation and Caution to Friends concerning buying or keeping of negroes." In this they state that slavery is contrary to the spirit of Christianity, and directly contrary to the golden rule. That "to buy souls and bodies of men for money, to enslave them and their posterity to the end of the world, we judge is a great hinderance to the spreading of Gospel." They caution Friends about buying negroes as it will be buying stolen goods. They recommend that no negroes should be bought except for the purpose of setting them free, and that those who have negroes should set them free after a reasonable time of service to compensate their masters for any expense.[2]

The first official action by Philadelphia Yearly Meeting

[1] *MS. Records.* Michener, 335; Brief Statement, 8.

"An effort has been made to take from the Quakers the credit of this important document, but the evidence that those who sent and those who received it regarded each other as members of the same religious society seems to me conclusive." Judge S. W. Pennypacker, *Pennsylvania Magazine*, iv. 31, note; *The Friend* (Phila.), xvii., 125, where a full account of the meetings is given.

[2] *Penna. Mag. of History*, xiii, 265.

was taken in 1696, when the following minute was passed. Friends are advised not "to encourage the bringing in any more negroes and that such as have negroes be careful of them, bring them to meetings, or have meetings with them in their families, and restrain them from loose and lewd living, as much as in them lies, and from rambling about on First Days or other times."[1]

It is evident that it was the moral and religious welfare of the negro, rather than his freedom, that claimed the attention at this time.

In 1711 Chester Quarterly Meeting, which seems to have been the one most alive to the subject, sent the following minute to the Yearly Meeting: "Chester Monthly Meeting's representatives reminded this meeting that their meeting was dissatisfied with friends buying and encouraging the bringing in of negroes, and desires the care of this meeting concerning it; and the above particulars to be according to order, presented by the representatives of this meeting, in writing to the next Yearly Meeting." The records of the Yearly Meeting note the reception of this minute and add: "After a due consideration of the matter, the meeting, considering that Friends in many other places are concerned in it as much as we are, advises that Friends may be careful, according to a former minute of this Yearly Meeting (1696) not to encourage the bringing of any more; and that all merchants or factors write to their correspondents to discourage them from sending any more."[2]

This was a rather mild statement, but it meant more than appears on the surface, for the next year in their epistle to London Yearly Meeting, they go into the matter at length, recapitulating the action of 1696 and of the previous year (1711), and going on to say, "as our settlements increased, so other traders flocked in amongst us, over whom we had no Gospel authority, and such have increased and multiplied negroes amongst us to the grief of divers friends whom we are willing to ease if the way might open clear to the satis-

[1] *MS. Records.* Michener, 335.

[2] *MS. Records.* See also, Watson, 482.

faction of the general; and it being last yearly meeting again moved, and Friends being more concerned with negroes in divers other provinces and places, than in these, we thought it rather too weighty to come to a full conclusion therein: this meeting therefore desires your assistance by way of counsel and advice therein, and that you would be pleased to take the matter into your weighty consideration, after having advised with Friends of the other American provinces, and give us your sense or advice therein."[1]

London Friends were fully as cautious as their Philadelphia brethren, and, moreover, did not care to be told what to do. They reply: "You had better first have advised with other plantations, and so have stated the case conjunctly; for want whereof we shall say the less, until such time as it is more generally represented. Only this we think meet to impart unto you as the sense of the Yearly Meeting—that the importing them from their native country by Friends is not a commendable nor allowed practice; and we hope Friends have been careful to avoid the same, remembering the command of our blessed Lord—'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.'" It seems strange to us of to-day that the Golden Rule should not have been applied to holding men in bondage as well as to bringing them from Guinea.[2]

The Philadelphia Friends did not let the matter rest, but replied to this epistle the same year (1714) in rather sharp terms. They say: "We also kindly received your advice about negro slaves, and we are one with you that the multiplying of them may be of a dangerous consequence, and therefore a law was made in Pennsylvania, laying twenty pounds duty upon every one imported there, which law the Queen was pleased to disannul. We could heartily wish that a way might be found to stop the bringing in more here; or at least, that Friends may be less concerned in buying or selling of any that may be brought in; and hope for your assistance with the government if any farther law should be

[1] *MS. Records*, Brief Statement, 9, 10.

[2] Bowden, ii., 199.

made discouraging the importation. We know not of any Friend amongst us that has any hand or concern in bringing any out of their own country; and we are of the same mind with you, that the practice is not commendable nor allowable amongst Friends; and we take the freedom to acquaint you, that our request unto you was, that you would be pleased to consult or advise with Friends in other plantations, where they are more numerous than with us; because they hold a correspondence with you but not with us, and your meeting may better prevail with them, and your advice prove more effectual."[1]

To this the London Friends seem to have only repeated the sentiments of their letter of 1713, and it does not appear that they took any further action in the matter for some years.

The subject was not allowed to drop in Philadelphia, for the Chester Friends again in 1715 expressed much anxiety about Friends engaging "in importing and buying negroes," but all that the Yearly Meeting would do, was to advise that such members as were concerned in such practices should be dealt with, and that those that had negroes should use them well. Chester meeting was not satisfied with this and returned to the charge in 1716, saying that "the buying and selling of negroes gives great encouragement for bringing them in" and desiring the meeting to take into consideration the prohibition of the practice of buying any that should be imported. The Yearly Meeting would not go even as far as this. It could see no better conclusion than that reached the previous year; but "in condescension to such friends as are straitened in their minds against the holding of them [slaves] it is desired that Friends generally do, as much as may be, avoid buying such negroes as shall hereafter be brought in rather than offend any Friends who are against it; yet this is only caution not censure."[2] In 1719 it would seem that some members had fallen into the practice of importing slaves, for that practice

[1] *MS. Records*, Brief Statement, 11.

[2] *MS. Records*, Brief Account, 13; Bowden, ii., 201.

is advised against.[1] After this the Yearly minutes do not refer to slavery, till 1729, but in that year the faithful friends of Chester sent a communication to the Yearly Meeting saying inasmuch as "we are restricted by a rule of discipline in being concerned in fetching or importing negro slaves from their own country, whether is it not as reasonable that we should be restricted from buying them when imported?" The answer to this question was deferred for a year.[2]

The conviction that the traffic in human beings was wrong had been spreading, and in 1730 the meeting was ready to take an advance step. The meeting reviewed the whole subject, and also the previous minutes passed by the meeting, and came to the conclusion "that Friends ought to be very cautious of making any such purchases for the future, it being disagreeable to the sense of this meeting." And monthly meetings were recommended to "see that such who may be, or who are likely to be, found in that practice, may be admonished and cautioned how they offend herein."[3] This advice was again issued in 1735, and repeated yearly, except in 1740, until 1743, and reports were sent to the Yearly Meeting annually on the subject. The records of the various monthly meetings show that much labor was expended to induce Friends to give up the practice of buying and selling slaves. In 1743 the following Query was added to those required to be answered annually to the Yearly Meeting: "Do Friends observe the former advice of our Yearly Meeting not to encourage the importation of negroes, nor to buy them after imported?"[4] In 1754 the meeting issued an epistle, believed to have been written by Anthony Benezet, and accepted by the meeting, "to testify their uneasiness and disunity with the importation and purchasing of slaves, and to direct the overseers of the several monthly meetings to advise and deal with such as engage therein." It is interesting to note that they say: "We have

[1] *MS. Records*, Michener, 341.
[2] *MS. Records*, Michener, 341; Brief Statement, 14.
[3] *MS. Records*, Brief Statement, 14; Michener, 341.
[4] *MS. Records.*

with sorrow to observe that the number is of late increased among us of those concerned in promoting the bondage of such unhappy people."[1] The next year they were ready to go still further, and they revised the annual Query, making it much stronger: "Are Friends clear of importing or buying negroes, and do they use those well which they are possessed of by inheritance or otherwise; endeavoring to train them up in the principles of the Christian religion?"[2]

This advance in sentiment was in large measure due to the work of individuals who had the welfare of the slave deeply at heart. The most prominent of these were William Burling, Ralph Sandiford, William Southby, Anthony Benezet, and, above all, John Woolman. These men were filled with a deep sense of the unrighteousness of slavery, and by all means in their power urged upon their friends, and the public, the iniquity and cruelty of holding men in bondage.

William Southby, or Southersby, as he sometimes spelt his name, was originally a Roman Catholic. He emigrated to Maryland before 1671. He joined the Society of Friends, and some years later removed to Pennsylvania. In 1684 he was a member of the Council, an office which he held several years. He was a born reformer; he was a warm advocate of the Indians; he spoke strongly against the custom of giving liquor to the company at funerals, a common practice in his day; he was an opponent of George Keith; but it was against slavery that he devoted most of his energy. As early as 1696 he laid before the monthly meeting a paper on the subject, accompanied with a copy of George Fox's *Gospel Order* (see page 264). This was referred to the quarterly meeting and then to the yearly meeting, an action which resulted in the advice issued in that year (see page 269). He was strenuously opposed to the action of the yearly meeting in consulting English Friends, believing that the Friends of Philadelphia should proceed independently. In 1712 he presented an individual petition to the Pennsylvania Assembly praying for the prohibition of slavery, probably the

[1] *MS. Records*, Brief Statement, 16–21; Michener, 342–345.
[2] *Ibid.*

first petition of the kind presented to any legislature in America. The following is record on the *Journal* concerning it: "3rd Mo., 8 (1712). A petition signed by William Southbe relating to negroes was read and ordered to lie on the table. 3rd Mo., 9 (1712). And to William Southbe's petition relating to the enlargement of Negroes, the House is of opinion, it is neither just nor convenient to set them at liberty." William Southby was greatly tried at the slowness of the Friends in the matter of slavery, and used his tongue and pen freely, and the latter more than once brought him into trouble. He died in 1718.[1]

Ralph Sandiford urged upon his fellow-members and the public the duty of manumission, and set the example himself by setting his own slaves free in 1733.[2]

Sandiford also used his pen freely, and some of his tracts on slavery had much effect.

An eccentric worker in the same cause was Benjamin Lay, at one time a member with Friends. He published in 1737 a treatise on *Slave-Keeping*, which he himself assiduously circulated. Whittier, in his introduction to Woolman, tells some amusing anecdotes of him.[3]

Anthony Benezet, the son of a Huguenot refugee, was born in 1715. When a young man he came to Philadelphia and engaged in the profession of teaching. It was not until 1750 that he became specially interested in the cause of the slave, but from that time his efforts on behalf of the oppressed were unremitting. He also used the press freely to spread his views, writing in the newspapers and in almanacs, and publishing pamphlets and books on the subject. His influence, therefore, was widespread. Thomas Clarkson acknowledges that his interest in the abolition of slavery

[1] *The Friend* (Phila.), xxvii., 293 *ff.*; *Votes of Assembly* (Penna), ii., 110, Philadelphia, 1752.

[2] It is probably to him that Kalm, the Swedish traveller, refers when he speaks of the only free negroes in Philadelphia (1748) as having been manumitted by a Quaker master. Watson, 484.

[3] Bowden, ii., 206; Whittier, 13. See also *Life of Lay, and Sandiford*, Roberts Vaux.

and the slave trade was chiefly due to one of Benezet's little books.[1]

By 1784 many of the Friends, notwithstanding the efforts already mentioned, had become slaveholders. Kalm, the Swede, already quoted, records in his account of his visit to Philadelphia, during this year: "Formerly . . . the Quakers alone scrupled to have slaves, now they are no longer so nice, and they have as many negroes as other people."[2]

That this was scarcely an exaggeration may be seen from the statement of a Friend, Isaac Jackson, who, as one of a committee, visited the members of the society in and about Philadelphia on the subject of slavery about the year 1759. He states that in one of the quarterly meetings he visited the owners of more than eleven hundred slaves, so deeply had the Friends become involved in the system.[3]

There must, however, have been a strong body of the membership opposed to slavery, or the words of Sandiford, Lay, and Benezet would not have had such effect.

The greatest and most earnest opponent of slavery was John Woolman. When he was only twenty he saw clearly that "slave-keeping" was "a practice inconsistent with the Christian religion." When on a religious visit to Virginia and Maryland, in 1746, he was deeply impressed with the evils of the system. In 1754, he published the first part of *Considerations on Keeping Negroes Recommended to the Professors of Christianity of every Denomination*, and the second part in 1762.[4]

This book was extensively circulated. Woolman not only spoke and labored with the Friends in Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, but visited the Southern colonies, Long Island, and New England as well, urging upon his brethren the

[1] Clarkson, i., 207. For a sketch of Benezet see *Life*, by Roberts Vaux, and also one by Wilson Armistead.

[2] Watson, 580.

[3] Whittier, 20.

[4] The first part was printed by Benjamin Franklin, and the second by Franklin and Hall.

iniquity of slave-keeping. To him and to his labors the whole society in America is greatly indebted for this faithful and loving service.

"The annual assemblage of the Yearly Meeting, in 1758, at Philadelphia," says John G. Whittier, "must ever be regarded as one of the most important religious convocations in the history of the Christian Church. The labors of Woolman and his few but earnest associates had not been in vain. . . . This meeting was looked forward to with varied feelings of solicitude by all parties. All felt that the time had come for some definite action; conservative and reformer stood face to face in the valley of decision." The matter was fully discussed. No one openly defended slavery, but the fear was expressed "lest the meeting should go into measures as might give uneasiness to many brethren, alleging that if Friends patiently continued under the exercise, the Lord in his time might open a way for the deliverance of these people." Again it was urged that dealing in slaves in the future should be forbidden. "To this it was answered that the most of this evil would never be effectually struck at, until a thorough search was made in the circumstances of such Friends as kept negroes with respect to the righteousness of their motives in keeping them, that impartial justice might be administered throughout." The cause of right prevailed. The meeting issued the strongest statement that had yet been put forth, and a committee was appointed to visit such members as held slaves.[1]

The minute says: "This meeting fervently desires . . . that we would steadily observe the injunction of our Lord and Master to do unto others as we would they should do unto us, which it now appears unto this meeting would induce such Friends who have any slaves, to set them at liberty—making a Christian provision for them according to their ages," etc.[2]

It does not appear that any were at this time excluded from membership on account of slaveholding, though the

[1] Whittier, 16; Woolman, 136, 137.

[2] *MS. Records*, Brief Statement, 22.

minute advised against the employment in church affairs of slaveholders. It was felt that patient continual labor should be bestowed upon delinquents.

By 1774 it appears that the membership was clear of buying or selling slaves, but many still held them. The meeting now directed that a report should be made of such as refused to "release from captivity" their slaves. This action had the effect of bringing about the manumission of a large number of negroes.[1]

The meeting waited another year, and then issued its final judgment against the practice. In the epistle of 1775 to the subordinate meetings it directed "that such members as continued to hold slaves be testified against as other transgressors are by the Rules of our Discipline for other immoral, unjust, and reproachful conduct." This meant exclusion from the Society. According to the custom of Friends this direction was carried out very slowly. Much labor was bestowed in persuasion before the edict of exclusion was pronounced. Each case was treated individually. The records of the Yearly Meeting show that there were for several years after this a few members who still held slaves, but that these cases were all under care. Most of the instances appear to have been those where slaves were left to minors, or where either husband or wife were not members of the Society, or where peculiar circumstances prevented legal manumission. It may be safely said that any one holding a slave after 1776 was a transgressor who was being dealt with. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, which included New Jersey, was practically clear of the evil by 1781,[2] and slaves had been recompensed for past service!

The history of the movement in the other Yearly Meetings was somewhat similiar to that just described, though

[1] *MS. Records*, Brief Statement, 35–42..

[2] The Records show a few cases like the above as late as 1794.

Some very interesting extracts relating to slaves and slavery, taken from the minutes of the Monthly Meeting of Gwynedd, Pa., will be found in "Historical Collections of Gwynedd" (p. 349 ff.) by Howard M. Jenkins, 8vo, Philadelphia, 1884.

in each there are incidents and differences of special interest, and in each the movement was to a great extent an independent one.

The first official action in New England Yearly Meeting appears to be a minute of Dartmouth (Mass.) Monthly Meeting, 10th month (Dec.) 1706, when Friends were desired "to bring their servants as well as children, to First-Day and mid-week meetings, and monthly meetings." Some Friends of the same monthly meeting (1st mo. [Mar.] 19th 1715-16) doubted whether "it be agreeable to truth to purchase slaves and hold them term of life." This question was referred to the Quarterly Meeting. This meeting apparently referred the matter back to the monthly meetings, for the following occurs in the records of Nantucket Monthly Meeting, 26th 9th month (Nov) 1716: "An epistle from the last quarterly meeting was read in this, and ye matter referred to this meeting, viz: whether it is agreeable to truth to purchase slaves and keep them term of life, was considered, and the sense and judgement of this meeting is, that it is not agreeable to truth for Friends to purchase and hold them term of life."[1] At Dartmouth Monthly Meeting, 10th month (Dec.) 1716 it was "concluded by ye most of the meeting that it would be most agreeable to our holy profession to forbear, for time to come, to be anyways concerned in purchasing any slaves."[2] Other meetings took somewhat similar views, and Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting brought up the matter before the Yearly Meeting in 1717, which records "That a weighty concern rested on the minds of Friends on account of importing and keeping slaves."[3] Nothing further is recorded on the minutes of the Yearly Meeting until 1727 when the practice of "importing negroes from their native country is censured." Again there is a long silence. In 1760 John Woolman was at the yearly meeting. He understood "That a large number of slaves had been imported from Africa and then were on sale by a member of our Society." This sorely "distressed" him. Before

[1] *MS. Records*, Dartmouth Monthly Meeting. *Nonslaveholder*, ii., 200.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] Brief Statement, 43.

leaving he had a private conference with some of those Friends who held slaves. His visit was well-timed, for at the same yearly meeting the Discipline was revised and a passage from the Epistle of London Yearly Meeting relative to the slave-trade was adopted, and inserted, and a Query, closely resembling that adopted by Philadelphia in 1755, was agreed upon.[1] This Query did not forbid the holding of slaves, and this fact was a cause of much uneasiness to the Friends of Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting who sent an epistle, 6th month 8th 1769, to the Yearly Meeting, suggesting that the meeting should consider whether "that part of the 10th Query expressed in these words "and use them well" etc., ought not to be either amended, or obliterated, seeing that they apprehended it inconsistent to possess them "as the brutal part of creation and yet use them well, or as slaves and at the same time bring them up in the true religion." The matter was referred to a committee of eleven, who reported at a subsequent session against any change in the Query at that time, but advised that an effort should be made to open the eyes of those who held slaves to the iniquity of the practice, and also that those who held slaves should be advised to treat them well, take them to places of worship, and to "give such as are young as least as much learning that they may be capable of reading." As a result of this movement a committee was appointed to visit slaveholders and reason with them.

The next year (1770) the committee reported that most of those who held slaves had been visited except in one Quarterly Meeting, and the committee was continued to carry on the work. The 10th Query was also revised so as to read "Are Friends clear of importing and buying or anyways disposing of negroes as slaves, and do they use those well that are under their care, not in circumstances through nonage or incapacity to be set at liberty, and do they give them that are young such an education as becomes Christians, and are the others encouraged in a virtuous life, and are all set at liberty that are of age, capacity, and ability

[1] Woolman, 163; Brief Statement, 44, 10.

suitable for freedom?" In their Epistle to London the same year (1770) the substance of this query was repeated as "a weighty concern" under which the meeting had rested for some time. New England Friends thus placed themselves on unmistakable ground.[1]

The committee already noticed reported progress in 1771, and 1772. Its members appear during their work to have been kindly received almost without exception. In the Epistle to London of this year (1772) it is stated "that a few Friends have freed their slaves but that some more have been so reluctant thereto that they have been disowned for not complying with the advice of this meeting." The same year Salem and Rhode Island Friends sent up questions in relation to slavery which were referred to a committee to consider and report upon the next year.[2] This committee made in 1773 a recommendation that all those held in bondage should be set free, and that the young and aged should be provided for as long as was necessary. The meeting adopted the recommendation, using the very words of the report, saying "we do no more claim property in the human race as we do in the beasts that perish." The Query was revised in accordance with this conclusion and made stronger. They also informed their English brethren of what they had done.[3] In 1774 the meeting recommended that all manumissions should be recorded in a special book, and that Friends should endeavor to get them also recorded in the town records. The same year a committee was appointed "to use their influence at the General Assembly of the Colony (Rhode Island) or with the members thereof, that such laws may be made as will tend to the abolition of slavery, and to get such laws repealed as any way encourage it."

Those of their members who still held slaves continued to claim attention, and in 1774, 1775, 1776 reports were sent to London Yearly Meeting that there were still a few who refused to obey the directions of the Yearly Meeting. The patience which was exhibited towards these recalcitrant members is remarkable, and shows how unwillingly any were

[1] *MS. Records.* [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

excluded from the Society.[1] In 1778 it was reported that no one except perhaps in Rhode Island Monthly Meeting held any slaves. In 1783 they wrote to London, "We know not but all the members of this meeting are clear of that iniquitous practice of holding or dealing with mankind as slaves." The same year the meeting directed that the slaves should be compensated for their past services. In 1784 it was concluded that such as refused to do this should be dealt with. By 1787 this end had been gained without resorting to disownment.[2]

The committee appointed to labor with the Legislature reported no success in 1776, and was continued. It was probably due to the war of Independence that nothing is recorded of this committee's labors until 1784, when in the epistle to London it is stated that "An application to the authority here on their (the slaves') behalf has also renewedly taken place, which has been so far favored as to obtain a law wherein all hereafter born within the State are declared free, and the importation of them here as slaves is in future prohibited."[3]

The Friends also turned their attention to other States, and were not unsuccessful.[4]

[1] The following extracts from the *MS. Records* of Sandwich Monthly Meeting (Mass.) will illustrate this: "At a Monthly Meeting of Sandwich, held at Rochester ye 2d Day of ye 6 mo. 1775. 3 Item. Sandwich Preparative Meeting Informs this meeting that Gideon Allen hath a Negro Slave. Jeremiah Austen & Peleg Dillens is appointed to visit him on that account and make Report to the next monthly meeting." "At a monthly meeting held at Sandwich ye 30th Day of ye 6th mo. 1775. 4th Item. "The Case of Gideon Allen's manumitting his Negro is refe'rd to next monthly meeting under the care of Jeremiah Austen & Peleg Dillens." "At a monthly meeting of Sandwich held at Fallmouth the 4th Day of ye 8th mo. 1775," the case is referred under the same committee to next monthly meeting, and so successively and in the same words to the next monthly meetings for the 9th and 10th months. "At a monthly meeting held at Sandwich the 3rd Day of ye 11th mo. 1775. 3rd (Item.) The Friends appointed to Inspect into Gideon Allen's Negro affair Reports that he has manumitted S'd Negro, which is Satisfactory to this meeting." —*MS. Records.*

[2] *MS. Records.*

[3] *MS. Records;* Arnold, *History of Rhode Island*, ii., 503; DuBois, 226.

[4] DuBois, 73; *MS. Records.*

So perished slavery among Friends in New England.

In New York the first who raised his voice against the evil was William Burling,[1] of whom it is said that "between the years 1680 and 1700" he "was in the practice of introducing the subject of slavery annually into the Yearly Meeting on Long Island."[2]

Clarkson says Burling was the first in the Society to bear his testimony against it. "He wrote also several tracts with the same design, one of which, published in the year 1718, he addressed to the elders of his own church."[3]

Before 1759 the Yearly Meeting had a query "Whether Friends were clear of importing or purchasing negroes or slaves." In 1767 Purchase Quarterly Meeting inquired of the Yearly Meeting "If it is not consistent with Christianity to buy and sell our fellowmen for slaves during their lives, and their posterity after them, then whether it is consistent with a Christian spirit to keep those in slavery we have already in possession, by purchase, gift, or any other way?" There is no record as to how the Yearly Meeting received this appeal. Like Chester meeting in Pennsylvania, Purchase Meeting continued to bring this subject before the meetings composing it and also before the Yearly Meeting.[4]

In 1771, the Yearly Meeting concluded "that those Friends that have negroes shall not sell them to others for slaves, excepting in cases of executors, administrators, or guardians, who are in that case to advise with their respective monthly meetings therein, if attended with difficulty, giving the said meeting the state of the case." At the same meeting a communication from the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in regard to slaves was read, and copies of it were sent to the quarterly meetings. A committee was also appointed "to visit them that have slaves, and see if there can a freedom be obtained for them that are suitable for it: and such as are not set free suitably instructed and provided for." In

[1] He is sometimes spoken of as Thomas Burling.

[2] *Non-slaveholder*, ii., 298; Clarkson, i., 146.

[3] Clarkson, i., 147.

[4] Brief Statement, 47, 48.

1772, this committee made an encouraging report. The meeting issued the same year an epistle to its members urging them "to faithfulness in supporting our Christian testimony against selling and buying negroes." In 1774, it was concluded that "those Friends that buy or sell negroes or otherwise dispose of them, so that after they come to the age of eighteen or twenty-one, according to their sex, they or their posterity are kept in bondage, shall be treated with as disorderly persons, and unless they are brought to a sense of their error, and set such at liberty, the monthly meeting they belong to shall testify against them." [1]

In 1775, committees were directed to be appointed to examine into the condition of those still in bondage. In 1776, the reports from the various meetings show that considerable labor had been expended with some result. It was decided that no Friends who continued to hold slaves should be employed in any church business. In 1777, reports show further progress in manumission, and meetings are directed "to testify against" those who still refuse to liberate their slaves of every age.

This seems to have been sufficient for all but a very few. In 1784 and 1785, but one Friend is reported as holding a slave. In 1787, the reports to the Yearly Meeting state that "no Friends are concerned in negroes as slaves." As in New England and Pennsylvania, the question of compensating the freed slaves for past services was brought up, Westbury meeting proposing it in 1781. The Yearly Meeting of 1782 accepted this view, and by 1784 all but three individuals had complied with the advice of the Yearly Meeting.[2]

Difficult as had been the task of eradicating slavery in the Yearly Meetings of the Middle and Northern States, it was easy compared with that placed before the Friends of Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas.

The earliest reference in the records of the Maryland meetings relative to slavery is one quite different from any which has been cited. It occurs in the Minutes of Third Haven Monthly Meeting, where in 1702 the meeting accepts

[1] Brief Statement, 47, 48.

[2] *Ibid.* 49–51.

twenty shillings a year, for thirty years, from a man to whom a negro woman and her child were left with the proviso that he should pay the meeting this sum for the ferriage of travelling Friends in Dorchester County. The legacy was accepted "for the service of truth."[1]

The influences surrounding Friends in Maryland were far from conducive to the spread of anti-slavery sentiments. Samuel Fothergill of England visited nearly all the meetings of Friends in America during the years 1754–56; and in a review of his visit, written after his return to England in 1756, he thus describes the Friends in Maryland: "Maryland is poor; the gain of oppression, the price of blood is upon that province—I mean their purchasing and keeping in slavery, negroes, the ruin of true religion the world over, wherever it prevails."[2]

Notwithstanding this gloomy state of affairs, the wave of feeling against slavery passed over the whole society. John Woolman, John Churchman, and others, visiting, all about the same time, the meetings everywhere, stirred up and encouraged the feeling; so that about the years 1754–58 it became a settled conviction in the minds of many, especially the younger members, that slavery was inconsistent with true Christianity. John Woolman was in Maryland and Virginia in 1758. In the same year the epistle from London Yearly Meeting was received, containing the paragraph against "the iniquitous practice of dealing in negroes or slaves," which brought the whole question before every Yearly Meeting in America, and must have had great weight in the discussions which took place in each meeting.

The Yearly Meeting held at West River, Maryland, 2d of 6th month, 1759, adopted a set of Queries almost identical with those adopted by Philadelphia, 1755.[3]

At the Yearly Meeting of 1760 "a weighty consideration, accompanied Friends respecting the word 'buying' of

[1] Michener, 337.

[2] Fothergill, 282.

[3] The only change of note was, "Are Friends careful of importing?" etc., instead of, "Are Friends clear of importing?" etc.

negroes contained in our Discipline and agreed to last year, which was advice against importing of negroes. This meeting under solid and mature consideration with divers remarks thereon, think Friends at present, are not fully ripe in these judgements to carry the minute further than against being concerned in the importing of negroes."[1]

At that time the Yearly Meeting held two sessions in the year; and at the session held in the 10th month, 1760, the matter was brought up again, and "a solemn conference was held," and the conclusion was reached that Friends "should not in any wise incourage there [sic] importation by buying or selling them to others as slaves." Any difficulty that might arise in carrying out this advice should be referred to the monthly or quarterly meetings.[2]

In 1767 the subject again claimed serious attention, and a special epistle was sent to the subordinate meetings in order to discourage "the prevailing practice of dealing in or delaying in bondage our fellow-creatures." A new and stronger Query on the subject was also adopted. In 1770 meetings were advised to be careful to avoid appointing "any to the station of Elder who do not appear to have a testimony in their hearts against the practice of slave-keeping." In 1771 a petition was directed to be prepared and presented to the Legislature of Maryland, setting forth "the evil consequences attending on said Practice [that of importing negro slaves] and requesting an act may be made to remedy this evil so far as in them lies." In 1773 the meeting felt the need of "more diligence and circumspection in the discharge of our religious duties, particularly to discourage the iniquitous

[1] *MS. Records Maryland* (afterwards Baltimore) *Yearly Meeting.*

[2] *MS. Records.* An illustration of how this advice was carried out will be of interest. It is taken from the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting of 1765. "The case of Robert George, Jr. being before this meeting and Friends being informed that he intends to purchase another slave, think best to use farther intreaties with him in order to convince him, if possible, of the inconsistency of such a conduct with the testimony of Truth: therefore this meeting appoints Joseph Bartlett, Henry Troth, and Joseph Berry to visit and treat with him in love for the same." The next Yearly Meeting a report was brought, that they (the committee) "prevailed on Robert George, Jr., not to purchase any more slaves, and that he is removed by death."

practice of keeping slaves." Contrary to what was the case in the Northern meetings, the reform element was stronger in the Yearly Meeting than in the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings; and in 1773, at the spring session, one meeting alone made a report. But matters were progressing better than some feared; for at the fall session a record was made, that "our testimony against slavery so far prevails that none have been imported, bought and sold since last accounts, except in an instance of two selling . . . which is under care." A similar report is made in 1774. In 1776 the meeting records "seventy manumissions since last year." It was concluded that subscriptions to the expenses of the Church should not be received from such as held slaves. A step in advance was also taken by the following minute: "Our several Quarterly and Monthly Meetings are earnestly enjoined to extend their help and assistance to such as have hitherto neglected to do justice to that oppressed people, and if any should continue so far to justify their conduct as to refuse that tender advice of their brethren, it is the solid judgement of this meeting that their continuing in this practice is become so burdensome, that such persons must be discontinued from our Society." In 1778 it was concluded that such as still refused to comply with the direction of the meeting were to be treated as "disorderly persons," who should be "dealt without delay." Friends were also advised not to hire any as slaves when the wages were to go to the owner, nor were Friends to act as overseers of labor where slaves were employed. It was further decided that slaves reaching the age of twenty for men, and eighteen for women, should be set free, in order that the action of the Society might be uniform. About the same time as in other Yearly Meetings a deep interest was also aroused for the education and Christianization of the slaves.

In 1785 it is recorded, "Our testimony against slavery is so far maintained that none are held in bondage except by a few to whom they have fallen lately by inheritance, and minors, who are under care, and some where the heads of families are not in membership."[1]

[1] *MS. Records.* Baltimore Daily *Sun*, October 30, 1893.

It will be interesting to give a specimen of a "Testimony of Disownment." These documents varied somewhat according to circumstances, but are essentially alike.

"Whereas Robert Waters, a member of our Religious Society, still continues in the practice of slave keeping notwithstanding much labor has been bestowed towards him to convince him of the unjust practice of the same, therefore for the clearing of Truth we disown him, the said Robert Waters, from being any longer a member of our Religious Society until it may please Divine Providence to bring him to a sight and sense of the unjust practice, and to condemn the same to the satisfaction of the Monthly Meeting, which that he may do is our desire. 12th Mo. 12, 1781.

"John Cowman, Clerk."[1]

While the history of the movement in Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia is similar to that of Maryland, it differs in one important respect,—in that the Virginia and Carolina Friends had for years to contend with laws that made emancipation almost impossible. This fact should always be borne in mind when reviewing the history of the movement in the Southern States.[2]

The first mention found in the records occurs in the year 1722, when a Query relating to negroes was adopted. This Query is almost identical with that adopted by Philadelphia in 1755, and by New England and Maryland in 1759. It reads as follows: "Are all Friends clear of being concerned in the importation of slaves or purchasing them for sale: do they use those well they are possessed of, and do they endeavor to restrain them from vice, and to instruct them in the principles of the Christian religion?"[3] This is the earliest form of this Query that the writer has found.

In 1739 an epistle was sent to North Carolina "concerning bearing arms, going to muster, and using negroes well." The same year, in response to an inquiry, it was decided that Friends should not "go patrolling to keep the negroes in subjection."[4]

[1] *MS. Records.*
[2] Weeks, 205.
[3] *MS. Records, Virginia Yearly Meeting.*
[4] *Ibid.* Bassett, 219.

In 1757 the Query relating to slavery was revised so as to allow members "to trade on" negroes. Against this addition, John Woolman, who was present, protested, but in vain. His earnestness, however, seems to have borne fruit,[1] for the very next year a strong clause was adopted, advising Friends not to "be concerned in importing, selling, buying, or overseeing slaves." In 1759 an interest in the education of slaves was manifested. In 1760 the words "for sale" were substituted for "to trade on" and in 1764 anxiety was felt that more care should be taken to instruct negroes in the Christian religion, to educate them better, and "to inspect diligently into their usage, clothing, and feeding."[2]

Benjamin Ferris, William Reckitt, and John Griffith visited Virginia and North Carolina in 1765, and spoke earnestly against the practice of slave-keeping. The effect of these faithful visitors is apparent in the meeting of 1766, where it was proposed "to put a stop to the further purchase of negroes"; but the decision was postponed for a year, at which time, "as Friends were divided in sentiment," it was again postponed.[3]

In 1768 it was reported that Friends were for the most part clear of importing or buying negroes, and it was now concluded that "none of our members for the time to come shall be permitted to purchase a negro or other slave without being guilty of a breach of our discipline." As in Pennsylvania, New York, and New England, individual meetings moved faster than the body at large, and the records show dealings with members and disownments some time before the Yearly Meeting was ready to take the final steps.[4]

In 1770 an effort was made to influence the Virginia Burgesses to repeal a law which "prevents the freedom of the slave," but the Burgesses would not respond. In 1772 the meeting agreed to purchase two dozen copies of Anthony Benezet's *Treatise on Slavery*, "to put into the hands of those

[1] *Journal*, 116, 117.
[2] *MS. Records.*
[3] *MS. Records; Friends' Miscellany*, xii., 253; John Griffith, 379, 380.
[4] *MS. Records.*

in power for their perusal." The Yearly Meeting being requested to give its sense upon the minute prohibiting the purchase of negroes, whether such as purchase slaves should be disowned, came to the conclusion that it is "the unanimous sense" of this meeting that such "as shall purchase a negro or other slave with no other view than their own benefit or convenience, and knowing it to be contrary to the rules of our Discipline, should be testified against unless they make acknowledgment."[1]

In 1773 all "who continue to withhold from any their just right to freedom" are earnestly recommended "to clear their hands of this iniquity."[2]

In 1779 those who continued the practice of owning or hiring slaves were to be admonished, and advised to stop.[3]

In 1782 the Legislature of Virginia passed an act relating to emancipation, which made it much less difficult to set slaves free; and many Friends took advantage of it and manumitted their negroes.[4] The committee to whom was intrusted the work of visiting the slave-holding members reported progress from year to year. In 1785 the Query was altered to read, "Do any hold slaves?" By 1787 the work was practically accomplished, though as late as 1798 two persons were reported as still holding slaves, "one of which," it is said, "appears to be a peculiar case, and the other under notice."[5]

The movement began in North Carolina, the only remaining American Yearly Meeting[6] at that time, later than in any other meeting. The first reference appears to be in 1740, when the epistle from Virginia, already referred to (p. 287)

[1] *MS. Records.*
[2] Janney, *History*, iii., 433.
[3] *MS. Records*; Weeks, 211.
[4] Weeks, 212.
[5] *Ibid.* 212.
[6] The Friends who lived in South Carolina and in Georgia were attached to North Carolina Yearly Meeting, and are included in the account of that Yearly Meeting, though they may not be mentioned by name. The Friends in Charleston, S.C., however, considered themselves a part of London Yearly Meeting. They were few in number, and in 1796 were transferred to North Carolina Yearly Meeting. Weeks, 93, 94. See also, *Life of Mary Neale*, pp. 335–340; Fothergill, 173–175.

was read.[1] In 1752, meetings were directed to be held for the negroes, and a Query was adopted: "Are all that have negroes careful to use them well, and encourage them to come to meeting as much as they reasonably can?" In 1768, in answer to an inquiry from the Western Quarterly Meeting, the Yearly Meeting concluded that the clause in the Discipline relative to buying and importing of negroes should be understood as a prohibition of buying negroes "to trade upon," and all were advised "to be careful not to buy or sell in any case that can be reasonably avoided." In 1769 the Western Quarterly Meeting asked for an absolute prohibition of slavery, but the Yearly Meeting was not ready. In 1770, members were forbidden to buy negroes of slave-dealers. In 1772 no Friend was to buy a negro from any person not a Friend, except to prevent the separation of husband and wife or parent and child, or for some other reason to be approved by the Monthly Meeting; and no one was to sell a slave to a slave-dealer. The same year a strong address was made to the Legislature against the further importation of negroes. In 1774, Thomas Newby desiring to set his slaves at liberty, it was decided "that all Friends finding themselves under a burden and uneasiness on account of keeping slaves, may set them at liberty by applying to the Monthly Meeting." Thomas Nicholson was also granted leave to publish *Liberty and Property*,—a tract in relation to the law regulating emancipation.

The matter was not allowed to rest, for in 1775 Western Quarterly Meeting again came to the front with a request that the Query should be so changed as "to relieve distressed minds." The committee to which this matter was referred, was unable to come to a decision, and, on the question being discussed in open meeting, it was concluded "that Friends in unity shall neither buy nor sell a negro without the consent of the Monthly Meeting to which they belong."

The next year (1776), after serious deliberation, it was recorded as "the unanimous sense of the meeting that all

[1] Bassett, 219.

the members thereof who hold slaves be earnestly and affectionately advised to clear their hands of them as soon as they possibly can; and that in the mean time no member be permitted to buy or sell any slaves or hire any from those who are not members of our Society." Disownment would follow disregard of this rule.[1] A serious check to manumission occurred in the re-enactment of a law of 1741 which forbade the manumission of a slave "except for meritorious services to be adjudged and allowed of by the County Court and license therefor had and first obtained." If any freed negroes were found within the State at the expiration of six months, they were to be sold at public sale by the "church-wardens." Under this new law, forty freed slaves were sold. The Friends carried the case to the courts, pleading the *ex post facto* character of the action, as the slaves had been freed before the passage of the act. They gained their case, though at great pecuniary expense.[2] The Legislature was not to be outdone, and in 1779 passed a new law, under which it was made still more difficult to manumit. But the work went on, in spite of all hindrances, until 1787, when slavery in North Carolina Yearly Meeting was at an end.

The North Carolina Friends, like their brethren elsewhere, were faithful in petitioning the Legislature, but were continually receiving rebuffs. At Edenton the Friends were presented (1796) by the Grand Jury "as authors of common mischief" for holding out the idea of emancipation to the slaves.[3]

With the completion of the work in North Carolina the long struggle was ended. In the Northern States it had but little effect upon the size of the membership; but in the Southern States, while there were comparatively few disownments, it led to the wholesale emigration to the West which has been so fully described by Mr. Stephen B. Weeks, in his exhaustive monograph *Southern Quakers and Slavery*.

[1] *Narrative, etc.*, pp. 1–12, as quoted in Bassett, pp. 219–223; Weeks, 208, 209.

[2] Bassett, 234; Weeks, 209, 210. A similar sale took place in 1796. *The Friend* (Phila.), xvii., 254.

[3] Weeks, 222.

The Society in Virginia and North Carolina was decimated, and those States lost a most valuable part of their population, which Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois gained to their lasting advantage.

The work of which a brief summary has been given, took almost exactly a century to accomplish, but it was done, and done thoroughly.

It remains to trace briefly the action of the Society in England. The first reference to slavery or the slave trade which the writer has found, occurs in the epistle from London Yearly Meeting to Philadelphia in 1713, in reply to one sent by the latter in 1712. The next is in the epistle to the same meeting in 1715. Both of these have been referred to in speaking of Philadelphia (p. 270, *ff.*). The next is in 1727, when the Yearly Meeting adopted the following minute: "It is the sense of this meeting that the importing of negroes from their native country and relatives by Friends is not a commendable nor allowed practice, and is therefore censured by this meeting." In 1758 the Friends were ready to speak more fully, for a long minute was adopted, warning all "to be careful to avoid being in any way concerned in reaping the unrighteous profits arising from the iniquitous practice of dealing in slaves."[1]

A clause similar to this was inserted the same year in the *Printed Epistle* which is sent to Friends in all parts of the world, and which, as has been seen, produced no little effect in America, where it was widely read. It was reprinted as an appendix to Anthony Benezet's *Observations*, etc., in 1760.[2] This minute spoke only of the slave trade. Engaging in this trade was made a disownable offence in 1761. In 1763 a fresh exhortation against in any way encouraging the trade was issued, and inserted in the *Printed Epistle*.[3]

That there was need of such advice is shown from the *Journal* of John Woolman, who, being then in England, records in 1772 that he "felt great distress of mind" "on

[1] *Brief Account*, 11; Bowden, ii., 199, 219; *Minutes and Advices*, 227.
[2] *Epistles*, i., 307; *Observations*, etc., 10.
[3] Bowden, ii., 219. *Minutes and Advices*, 228. *Epistles*, i., 328.

account of the members of our Society being mixed with the world in various sorts of traffic. Great is the trade to Africa for slaves; and for the loading of these ships a great number of people are employed in their factories, among whom are many of our Society."[1]

Again must the simple-hearted faithful Woolman have had great influence, for the same year the Yearly Meeting inserted a paragraph in the *Printed Epistle*, expressive of satisfaction that through the efforts of Friends "slavery has been lessened in North America." The English Friends desire that these efforts should be continued so that "through the favor of Divine Providence, a traffic so unmerciful and unjust in its nature to a part of our own species made equally with ourselves for immortality, may come to be considered in its proper light; and be utterly abolished, as a reproach to the Christian Profession."[2]

In the Epistle of 1774 the English Friends speak of "the inhuman practice of slave keeping," and of "that flagrant injustice to our fellow-creatures, for whom our Saviour shed his precious blood, as well as for others, and to whom he dispenseth a measure of his grace in common with the rest of mankind."[3] From this time mention of the iniquity of slavery is made in almost every annual epistle, and all are encouraged to persevere in their efforts for its abolition.

Naturally, as there were no slaves in England, the active efforts of the Friends were directed against the slave trade. The first petition against the trade which was ever presented to Parliament was that presented by the Friends in 1783. It is interesting to know that this was done at the instance of American Friends, as the following minute shows. London Yearly Meeting, 6th month 13th 1783. "This meeting having in a very weighty and solemn manner considered the recommendation of our brethren in America to take under consideration an application to those in power in

[1] *Journal*, 262.

[2] *Epistles*, ii., 10. The paragraph was also inserted in the *Minutes and Advices*, as the English book of Discipline was then called, p. 227.

[3] *Epistles*, ii., 20.

favor of the poor enslaved negroes, it is the solid judgment of this meeting that this weighty work should begin by an address to the king." [The committee,] to which the preparation of the address was intrusted, reported on the 16th, that, "being informed that a bill is ordered to be brought into the House of Commons to make some regulations respecting the African slave trade, [the Committee] judged it most proper immediately to petition the House of Commons." A paper was produced, signed by 258 Friends, and directed to be presented to the House of Commons. It was respectfully received, and laid upon the table. The same year the meeting directed an inquiry to be made to see whether any Friends were concerned in the traffic. The "Meeting for Sufferings" also issued an appeal to Parliament, going more fully into the case. This short pamphlet was widely circulated, copies being sent, to the King, officers of Government, every member of Parliament, and to many influential persons throughout the kingdom.[1] It was in 1783 also that a few Friends formed the first Abolition Society.[2]

In 1785 the "Meeting for Sufferings," representing the Yearly Meeting, arranged for the distribution of Anthony Benezet's *Caution to Great Britain and Her Colonies*, etc. Copies were sent to most of the great public schools in order to influence the minds of the young, to the clergy, and to prominent individuals throughout the country. From this time the English Friends labored earnestly and unweariedly for the suppression of the slave trade. A second petition was presented to Parliament in 1793, and a third in 1798. Both were unsuccessful in accomplishing any direct results.[3]

The century closed with Friends everywhere non-slave-

[1] *The Yorkshireman*, iv., 318–320; Clarkson, i., 120, 121. The title of the pamphlet is, "The Case of our Fellow-Creatures, the Oppressed Africans, respectfully recommended to the Serious Consideration of the Legislature of Great Britain by the People called Quakers." London, 1784. The "Meeting for Sufferings" is a select body which acts for the Yearly Meeting when the latter is not in session. In America a similar body is usually called the "Representative Meeting."

[2] Clarkson, i., 123 *ff.*

[3] *Yorkshireman*, iv., 331; *Epistles*, ii., 103.

holders, and earnest in their efforts to do whatever lay in their power to suppress the slave trade, to free the slave, to educate and care for those who might be set free, and to soften the hardships of those still held in bondage.[1]

[1] As soon as the true character of slavery was recognized, the members of the Society, as individuals and as a church, began to endeavor to influence public opinion and legislation. The full history of these efforts lies without the limits of the foregoing essay. Some individual cases have been mentioned, but there were many more previous to 1800. These petitions were addressed, first, to the legislatures of the various Colonies, and then to those of the States, and to the Congress of the United States. They prayed for the suppression of the slave trade, for the amelioration of the slave, for the enactment of just emancipation laws, and finally for the total abolition of slavery. The efforts of the Friends in these directions, though accomplishing little directly, except in New England and in Pennsylvania, kept the matter before the public, and not unfrequently provoked lively discussions in the legislative halls, and so served a good purpose. Many of these efforts are described in Du Bois's *Suppression of the Slave Trade*. See index to that work.

APPENDIX.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS' PROTEST AGAINST SLAVERY, 1688.

THIS IS TO Y^R^ MONTHLY MEETING HELD AT RICHARD WORRELL'S.

These are the reasons why we are against the traffick of men-body, as followeth. Is there any that would be done or handled at this manner? viz., to be sold or made a slave for all the time of his life? How fearful and faint-hearted are many on sea, when they see a strange vessel,—being afraid it should be a Turk, and they should be taken, and sold for slaves into Turkey. Now what is this better done, as Turks doe? Yea, rather is it worse for them, which say they are Christians; for we hear that ^ye^ most part of such negers are brought hither against their will and consent, and that many of them are stolen. Now, ^tho^ they are black, we can not conceive there is more liberty to have them slaves, as it is to have other white ones. There is a saying, that we shall doe to all men like as we will be done ourselves; making no difference of what generation, descent or colour they are. And those who steal or robb men, and those who buy or purchase them, are they not all alike? Here is liberty of conscience, ^wch^ is right and reasonable; here ought to be likewise liberty of ^ye^ body, except of evil-doers ^wch^ is an other case. But to bring men hither, or to rob and sell them against their will, we stand against. In Europe there are many oppressed for conscience sake; and here there are those oppressed ^wh^ are of a black colour. And we who know that men must not comitt adultery,—some do committ adultery, in others, separating wives from their husbands and giving them to others; and some sell the children of these poor creatures to other men. Ah! doe con-

sider well this thing, you who doe it, if you would be done at this manner? and if it is done according to Christianity? You surpass Holland and Germany in this thing. This makes an ill report in all those countries of Europe, where they hear off, that ye Quakers doe here handel men as they handel there ye cattle. And for that reason some have no mind or inclination to come hither. And who shall maintain this your cause, or pleid for it? Truly we can not do so, except you shall inform us better hereof, viz., that Christians have liberty to practise these things. Pray, what thing in the world can be done worse towards us, than if men should rob or steal us away, and sell us for slaves to strange countries; separating husbands from their wives and children. Being now this is not done in the manner we would be done at therefore we contradict and are against this traffic of men-body. And we who profess that it is not lawful to steal, must, likewise, avoid to purchase such things as are stolen, but rather help to stop this robbing and stealing if possible. And such men ought to be delivered out of ye hands of ye robbers, and set free as well as in Europe. Then is Pennsylvania to have a good report, instead it hath now a bad one for this sake in other countries. Especially whereas ye Europeans are desirous to know in what manner ye Quakers doe rule in their province;—and most of them doe look upon us with an envious eye. But if this is done well, what shall we say is done evil?

If once these slaves (wch they say are so wicked and stubbern men) should joint themselves,—fight for their freedom—and handel their masters and mastrisses as they did handel them before; will these masters and mastrisses take the sword at hand and warr against these poor slaves, licke, we are able to believe, some will not refuse to doe; or have these negers not as much right to fight for their freedom, as you have to keep them slaves?

Now consider well this thing, if it is good or bad? And in case you find it to be good to handel these blacks at that manner, we desire and require you hereby lovingly, that you may inform us herein, which at this time never was done, viz., that Christians have such a liberty to do so. To the end we shall be satisfied in this point, and satisfie likewise our good friends and acquaintances in our natif country, to whose it is a terror, or fairful thing, that men should be handeld so in Pennsylvania.

This is from our meeting at Germantown, held ye 18 of the 2 month, 1688, to be delivered to the Monthly Meeting at Richard Worrel's.

Garret henderich
derick up de graeff
Francis daniell Pastorius
Abraham up Den graef

At our Monthly Meeting at Dublin, ye 30—2 mo., 1688, we having inspected ye matter, above mentioned, and considered of it, we find it so weighty that we think it not expedient for us to meddle with it here, but do rather commit it to ye consideration of ye Quarterly Meeting; ye tenor of it being nearly related to ye Truth.

On behalf of ye Monthly Meeting,
Signed, P. Jo. Hart.

This, above mentioned, was read in our Quarterly Meeting at Philadelphia, the 4 of ye 4th mo. '88, and was from thence recommended to the Yearly Meeting, and the above said Derick, and the other two mentioned therein, to present the same to ye above said meeting, it being a thing of two great a weight for this meeting to determine.

Signed by order of ye meeting,

ANTHONY MORRIS.

YEARLY MEETING MINUTE ON THE ABOVE PROTEST.

At a Yearly Meeting held at Burlington the 5th day of the 7th month, 1688.

A Paper being here presented by some German Friends Concerning the Lawfulness and Unlawfulness of Buying and keeping Negroes, It was adjudged not to be so proper for this Meeting to give a Positive Judgment in the Case, It having so General a Relation to many other Parts, and therefore at present they forbear It.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

MANUSCRIPT RECORDS.

Records of Sandwich (Mass.) Monthly and Quarterly Meetings, beginning 1672.

Records of New England Yearly Meeting, beginning 1683.

Records of Virginia Yearly Meeting, beginning 1673.

Records of Maryland, afterwards Baltimore, Yearly Meeting, beginning 1677.

The Records of Baltimore Yearly Meeting were kindly searched through for the author by Kirk Brown, the custodian.

Records of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting beginning 1681.

Records of Dartmouth (Mass.) Monthly Meeting.

The author is indebted to the kindness of Dr. Edward T. Tucker of New Bedford, for extracts from the Records of Dartmouth Monthly Meeting.

Records of various Monthly and Quarterly Meetings in New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia.

PRINTED AUTHORITIES.

ARNOLD SAMUEL G. *History of the State of Rhode Island*, etc. 8°, 2 vols., Providence, 1894.

ARMISTEAD, WILSON. *Anthony Benezet.* 12°, London, 1859.

BASSETT, JOHN S. *Slavery and Servitude in North Carolina.* "Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science." 8°, vol. xiv., Baltimore, 1876.

BENEZET, ANTHONY. *A Caution to Great Britain and her Colonies*, etc. London, 1784.

[Benezet, Anthony.] *Observations on the Inslaving, importing and purchasing of Negroes; With some Advice thereon, extracted from the Epistle of the Yearly-Meeting of the People called Quakers, held at London in the year 1758,* etc. 12°, 2d ed, Germantown. Printed by Christopher Sower, 1760.

BESSE, JOSEPH. *Sufferings of the Quakers,* etc. Folio, 2 vols., London, 1753.

BETTLE, EDWARD. *Notices of Negro Slavery as Connected with Pennsylvania,* in "Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania," vol. i. Reprint, Philadelphia, 1864.

BOWDEN, JAMES. *The History of the Society of Friends in America.* 8°, 2 vols., London, 1850–54.

Brief Statement of the Rise and Progress of the Testimony of the Religious Society of Friends against Slavery and the Slave Trade. Published by direction of the Yearly Meeting, held in Philadelphia, in the Fourth Month, 1843. 12°, Philadelphia, 1843.

Case of our Fellow-Creatures the oppressed Africans, respectfully recommended to the Serious Consideration of the Legislature of Great Britain by the People called Quakers. 15 pp., 8°, London, 1784.

CLARKSON, THOMAS. *History, etc., of the Abolition of the Slave Trade.* 8°, 2 vols., London, 1808.

CROSFIELD, GEORGE. *Memoirs, etc., of Samuel Fothergill.* 8°, New York, 1844. (Cited under Fothergill.)

DU BOIS, W. E. B. *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade,* etc. 8°, New York, 1896.

EDMUNDSON, WILLIAM. *Journal,* etc. Sm. 4°, Dublin, 1715.

Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in London, 1681–1857. 8°, 2 vols., London, 1858.

FOX, GEORGE. *Journal.* Folio, London, 1694.

FOX, GEORGE. *Epistles.* Folio, London, 1698.

FOX, GEORGE. *Gospel Order,* etc., quoted in *The Friend,* vol. xvii., 28, 29. 4°, Philadelphia, 1844.

FOTHERGILL, SAMUEL. *Journal,* see Crosfield, G.

The Friend, 4°, vols. xvii., xxvii., Philadelphia, 1843–44, 1854–55.

Friends' Miscellany. 12°, vol. xii., Philadelphia, 1840.

GRIFFITH, JOHN. *Journal,* etc. 8°, Philadelphia, 1780.

HAZARD, SAMUEL. *Annals of Pennsylvania,* etc., 1609–1682. 8°, Philadelphia, 1850.

JANNEY, SAMUEL M. *Life of William Penn.* 8°, 2d ed., Philadelphia, 1852.

JANNEY, SAMUEL M. *History of the Religious Society of Friends,* etc. 12°, 4 vols., Philadelphia, 1859–1867.

MICHENER, EZRA. *Retrospect of Early Quakerism.* 8°, Philadelphia, 1860.

Minutes and Advices, etc. 4°, 1st ed., London, 1783.

Narrative of Some of the Proceedings of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting on the Subject of Slavery within its Limits, 1848. (Cited in Bassett.)

NEALE, MARY. *Some Account of the Life and Religious Exercises of Mary Neale, formerly Mary Peisley, Principally compiled from her own Writings* (Being part of vol. Lives of Samuel and Mary Neale). 12°, London, 1845.

Non-Slave-Holder. 8°, vol. ii., Philadelphia, 1847.

Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography. 8°, vols. iv., xiii., Philadelphia, 1880, 1889.

SEWEL, WILLIAM. *The History of the Rise, Increase and Progress of the Christian People called Quakers*, etc. Folio, London, 1725.

VAUX, ROBERTS. *Life of Anthony Benezet.* 12°, Philadelphia, 1817.

VAUX, ROBERTS. *Ralph Sandiford and Benjamin Lay.* 16°, Philadelphia, 1816.

WATSON, JOHN F. *Annals of Philadelphia.* 8°, Philadelphia, 1830.

WEEKS, STEPHEN B. *Southern Quakers and Slavery.* 8°, Baltimore, 1896.

WHITTIER, JOHN GREENLEAF. *Introduction to the Journal of John Woolman.* 12°, Boston, 1876.

WOOLMAN, JOHN. *Journal* edited by John Greenleaf Whittier. 12°, Boston, 1876.

[Woolman, John.] *Considerations on Keeping Negroes*, etc. Philadelphia, 1784.

The Yorkshireman. LUKE HOWARD. 8°, vol. iv., Pontefract, 1836.

LIST OF MEMBERS

OF THE

American Society of Church History

DECEMBER 31, 1896,

WHEN IT WAS MERGED WITH THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

Brieger, Theodor, Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1870), Lic. Theol. (Halle, 1870), D.D. (*hon.* Göttingen, 1877), Professor of Church History, Leipzig, Germany.

Comba, Emilio, D.D. (*hon.* St. Andrews, Scotland, 1885), Professor of Historical Theology in the Waldensian College, Florence, Italy.

Creighton, Rt. Rev. Mandell, LL.D. (*hon.* Glasgow, 1884; Harvard, 1886), D.C.L. (Durham, 1885), D.D. (Oxford, 1891), Bishop of London, England.

Harnack, Adolph, Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1873), Lic. Theol. (Leipzig, 1874), D.D. (*hon.* Marburg, 1879), Professor of Church History, Berlin, Germany.

Mitchell, Rev. Alexander Ferrier, D.D. (St. Andrews, 1862), LL.D. (Glasgow, 1892), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, St. Andrews, Scotland.

Nippold, Friedrich, D.D. (Leiden, 1870), Professor of Church History, Jena, Germany.

Schickler, Baron Fernand de, President of the Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, Paris, France.

Wace, Rev. Henry, D.D. (Oxford, 1883; Edinburgh, 1882), Principal of King's College, London, Eng.

Weizsäcker, Rev. Carl Heinrich von, Ph.D. (Tübingen, 1842), D.D. (*hon.* Tübingen, 1862), Professor of Church History, Tübingen, Germany.

Total 9

ACTIVE MEMBERS.

Abbott, Rev. Lyman, Congregationalist, D.D. (University of the City of New York, 1877), Editor of *The Outlook*, New York City.

*Adams, Henry, Quincy, Massachusetts.

Albree, Joseph, Allegheny, Pa.

Allen, Rev. Joseph Henry, Unitarian, D.D. (Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1891), Cambridge, Mass.

Bacon, Rev. Leonard Woolsey, Congregationalist, M.D., D.D. (both Yale College, New Haven, Conn. 1856, and 1879, respectively), Norwich, Conn.

Bagley, Burton Dillon, President of the Christian Literature Company, New York City.

Baird, Rev. Henry Martyn, Presbyterian, Ph.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1867), D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1877), LL.D. (College of New Jersey, 1882), Litt. D. (Princeton University, N. J., 1896), Professor

* Life Member.

of Greek, New York University, New York City.

Baldwin, Rev. Ralph Howard, Episcopalian, New York City.

Bartlett, Rev. Edward Totterson, S.T.D. (University of Pa., Philadelphia, Pa., 1887), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Dean, of the P.E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bassett, Rev. Austin Bradley, Pastor of the East Congregational Church, Ware, Mass.

Beiler, Rev. Samuel Lynch, Methodist Episcopal, Ph.D. (Boston University, Boston, Mass., 1891; University of the City of New York, 1891), Vice-Chancellor of the American University, Washington, D. C.

Berger, Rev. Daniel, United Brethren in Christ, D.D. (Westfield College, Westfield, Ill., 1878), editor of the Sunday-school literature of the United Brethren Publishing House, Dayton, Ohio.

Blatchford, Eliphalet Wickes, Chicago, Ill.

Booth, Rev. Henry Matthias, Presbyterian, D.D., LL.D. (both Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., 1880, and 1894, respectively), President of the Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

Bowen, Rev. John Wesley Edward, Ph.D. (Boston University, Boston, Mass., 1887), D.D. (Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga., 1892), Professor of Historical Theology, Gammon Theological Seminary (Methodist Episcopal), Atlanta, Ga.

Bowler, William, Cleveland, O.

Buckley, Rev. James Munroe, D.D. (Wesleyan Univ., Middletown, Conn., 1876), LL.D. (Emory and Henry College, Emory, Wash. Co., Va., 1882), Editor of *The Christian Advocate* (Methodist Episcopal), New York City.

Burr, George Lincoln, Professor of Ancient and Mediæval History, and Librarian of the White Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Burrage, Rev. Henry Sweetser, D.D. (Brown University, Providence, R. I., 1883), Editor of *Zion's Advocate* (Baptist), Portland, Maine.

Byington, Rev. Ezra Hoyt, Congregationalist, D.D. (University of Vermont, Burlington, 1890), Newton, Mass.

Carroll, Rev. Henry King, Methodist Episcopal, LL.D. (Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., 1885), religious editor of *The Independent*, New York City.

Christie, Rev. Francis Albert, Professor of Church History, Meadville (Unitarian) Theological School, Meadville, Pa.

Coe, Rev. Edward Benton, D.D., LL.D. (both Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1881 and 1893, respectively), D.D. (Yale, 1885), one of the pastors of the Collegiate Dutch Church, New York City.

Corwin, Rev. Edward Tanjore, D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1871), Pastor of Reformed (Dutch) Church, Greendale, N. Y.

Craig, Rev. Willis Green, D.D. (Centre College, Danville, Ky., 1873), LL.D. (Greenville and Tusculum College, Tusculum, Tenn., 1888), Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, McCormick Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Cramer, Rev. Michael John, Methodist Episcopal, D.D. (Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., 1873), LL.D. (Taylor University, Upland, Grant Co., Indiana, 1895), East Orange, N. J.

Craven, Rev. Elijah Richardson, D.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1859), LL.D. (Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 1889), Secretary of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church, Phila.

Crawford, Rev. William Henry, Methodist Episcopal, D.D. (Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., 1893), President of Alleghany College, Meadville, Pa.

Crooks, Rev. George Richard, D.D., LL.D. (both Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 1857 and 1869, respectively), Professor of Church History, Drew Theological (Methodist Episcopal) Seminary, Madison, N. J.

Davidson, Thomas, New York City.

DeWitt, Rev. John, D.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1877), LL.D. (Hanover College, Ind.,

1888) Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Princeton, N. J.

Dexter, Rev. Morton, Editor of *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Mass.

Dickinson, Rev. Cornelius Evarts, Pastor of the Congregational Church, Marietta, O.

Dodge, William Earl, New York City.

Drury, Rev. John Benjamin, Reformed (Dutch), D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1880), Editor of *The Christian Intelligencer*, New York City.

Dubbs, Rev. Joseph Henry, Reformed (German), D.D. (Ursinus College, Collegeville P. O., Pa., 1878), Professor of History and Archæology, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

Dulles, Rev. Joseph Heatly, Presbyterian, Librarian of Princeton Theological Seminary, N. J.

Eddy, Rev. Richard, Universalist, S.T.D. (Tufts College, College Hill, Mass., 1883), East Providence, R. I.

Elliott, Rev. George, D.D., (Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia., 1890), Pastor Spring Garden St. M. E. Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Emerton, Ephraim, Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1876), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Ewell, Rev. John Lewis, Congregationalist, Professor of Historical Theology and Dean of the Theological Department, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Faulkner, Rev. John Alfred, Pastor of the Chenango Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Binghamton, N. Y.

Ferree, Barr, New York City.

Fisher, Rev. George Park, Congregationalist, D.D. (Brown University Providence, R. I., 1866; Edinburgh University, Scotland, 1886; Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1886; Princeton University, N. J., 1896), LL.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1879), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Foote, Rev. Lewis Ray, D.D. (Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., 1889), Pastor of the Throop Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Frazer, Abner Lord, Duluth, Minn.

Gates, Rev. Caleb Frank, Congregationalist, Harpoot, Turkey.

Good, Rev. James Isaac, D.D. (Ursinus College, Collegeville P. O., Pa., 1887), Professor of Church History [Reformed (German)], Theological Seminary of Ursinus College, and Pastor in Reading, Pa.

Gordon, Rev. John, D.D. (Western Univ. of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1889), Professor of Church History, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Omaha, Neb.

Grammer, Rev. Carl Eckhardt, Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon Law, Theological Seminary, (P. E.), Va.

Haas, Rev. John Augustus William, Pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, New York City.

* Hagerman, James John, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Hamilton, Rev. John Taylor, Professor of Church History, Moravian Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.

Hamilton, Rev. William Ferguson, Presbyterian, D.D. (Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., 1880), Washington, Pa.

Hamlin, Rev. Teunis Slingerland, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1886), Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of the Covenant, Washington, D. C.

Hamma, Rev. Michael Wolf, Lutheran, D.D. (Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, 1876), Washington, D. C.

Hartranft, Rev. Chester David, D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1876), President of Theological Seminary (Congregational), Hartford, Conn.

Hoes, Rev. Roswell Randall, Presbyterian, Chaplain U. S. Navy.

Hoppin, Rev. James Mason, Congregationalist, D.D. (Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., 1870), Professor of the History of Art, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Horn, Rev. Edward Traill, D.D. (Roanoke College, Salem, Va., and

* Life Member.

Newberry College, Newberry, S. C., both 1888), Pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Charleston, S. C.

Horr, Rev. George Edwin, Jr., D.D. (Brown University, Providence, R. I., 1896), Editor of *The Watchman* (Baptist), Boston, Mass.

Hubbard, Hon. Gardiner Greene, LL.D. (Columbian University, Washington, D. C., 1888), Washington, D. C.

Hulbert, Rev. Eri Baker, Baptist, D.D. (Baptist Union Theological Seminary, Morgan Park, Ill., 1880), Professor of Church History, University of Chicago, Ill.

Hulbert, Rev. Henry Woodward, Presbyterian, Professor of Church History, Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O.

Hull, Rev. William, Editor of *The Eastern Lutheran*, and Lecturer on Ecclesiastical Law, Hartwick (Lutheran) Seminary, Otsego Co., N. Y., Albany, N. Y.

Hurst, Rev. John Fletcher, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, D.D., LL.D. (both Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 1866 and 1877, respectively), Washington, D. C.

Jackson, Rev. George Anson, Pastor of the Congregational Church, Swampscott, Mass.

* Jackson, Rev. Samuel Macauley, Presbyterian, LL.D. (Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., 1892), D.D. (University of the City of New York, 1893), Professor of Church History, New York University, New York City.

Jackson, Rev. Sheldon, Presbyterian, D.D. (Hanover College, Hanover, Ind., 1874), United States General Agent of Education for Alaska, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Alaska Division, Washington, D. C.

Jacobs, Rev. Henry Eyster, D.D. LL.D. (both Thiel College, Greenville, Pa., 1877 and 1891, respectively), Professor of Systematic Theology, Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

Johnson, Rev. Thomas Cary, D.D. (Hampden Sidney College, Va., 1891), Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity, Union Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Hampden Sidney, Va.

Jones, Rev. Hosea Williams, D.D. (Kenyon College, Gambier, O., 1884), Dean and Professor of Church History in the Divinity School of Kenyon College (P.E.), Gambier, O.

Krotel, Rev. Gottlob Frederick, D.D. (Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 1865), LL.D. (Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., 1888), Pastor Emeritus of Lutheran (General Council) Holy Trinity Church, New York City.

Laidlaw, Rev. Walter, Presbyterian, Ph.D. (New York University, 1896), New York City.

Lampe, Rev. Joseph Joachim, D.D. (Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., 1889), Ph.D. (University of the City of N. Y., 1890), Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, Omaha (Presbyterian) Theological Seminary, Neb.

Lasby, Rev. Charles Crowther, Methodist Episcopal, Pastor in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Lasher, Rev. George William, Baptist, D.D. (Madison University, Hamilton, N.Y., 1874), Editor of the *Journal and Messenger*, Cincinnati, O.

* Lea, Henry Charles, LL.D. (University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1868; Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1890; Princeton University, N. J., 1896), Philadelphia, Pa.

* Learned, Rev. Dwight Whitney, Congregationalist, Ph.D. (Yale College, New Haven, Conn., 1873), Kioto, Japan.

Leavens, Rev. Philo French, D.D. (University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., 1888), Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Passaic, N. J.

Lewis, Rev. Abram Herbert, D.D. (Alfred University, Alfred Centre, N. Y., 1881), Seventh-Day Baptist, author and editor, Plainfield, N. J.

Ludlow, Rev. James Meeker, D.D. (Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., 1872), Litt.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1888), Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, East Orange, N. J.

* McCook, John James, LL.D. (University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 1890, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 1893), New York City.

* Life Member.

MacCracken, Rev. Henry Mitchell, Presbyterian, D.D. (Wittenberg College, Springfield, O., 1877), LL.D. (Miami University, Oxford, O., 1887), Chancellor of the New York University, New York, City.

McGiffert, Rev. Arthur Cushman, Ph.D. (Marburg, Germany, 1888), D.D. (Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Adelbert, O., 1892), Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), New York City.

Mackay-Smith, Alexander, D.D. (Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., 1889), S. T. D. (Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., 1889), Rector of St. John's P. E. Church, Washington, D. C.

McLanahan, George William, Washington, D. C.

Mathews, Shailer, Baptist, Associate Professor of New Testament History and Interpretation, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Miller, Rev. William Sydney, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Crafton, Pa.

Mitchell, Edwin Knox, D.D. (Marietta College, Marietta, O., 1892), Professor of Græco-Roman and Eastern Church History, Theological Seminary (Congregational), Hartford, Conn.

Moncrieff, John William, Baptist, Assistant Professor of Church History, University of Chicago, Ill.

Morrow, Rev. James, Methodist Episcopal, D.D. (Anita College, Anita, Ala., 1882) Secretary of the American Bible Society for the State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Munro, Dana Carleton, Professor of Roman and Mediæval History, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Newman, Rev. Albert Henry, Baptist, D.D. (Mercer University, Macon, Ga., 1885), LL.D. (Southwestern Baptist University, Jackson, Tenn., 1883), Professor of Church History and Comparative Religion, McMaster University, Toronto, Canada.

Nicum, Rev. John, D.D. (Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., 1893), Director of Wagner College (Lutheran), Rochester, N. Y.

Norcross, Rev. George, D.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1879), Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Pa.

O'Gorman, Rt. Rev. Thomas, Roman Catholic, D.D. (by Pope Leo XIII., 1891), Bishop of Sioux Falls, S. D.

Paine, Rev. Levi Leonard, D.D. (Yale College, New Haven, Conn., 1875), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, (Congregational) Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

Pellew, Hon. Henry Edward, Washington, D. C.

Perry, Rt. Rev. William Stevens, S.T.D. (Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., 1869), D.D. (Oxford University, Eng., 1888), LL.D. (William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., 1876), D.C.L. (University of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Can., 1885; King's College University, Windsor, N. S., 1887), Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Iowa, Davenport, Ia.

Pollard, Rev. Edward Bagby, Baptist, Ph.D. (Yale College, New Haven, Conn., 1893), Roanoke, Va.

Potter, Rt. Rev. Henry Codman, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1865; Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., 1883; Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1890; Oxford University, Eng., 1892), LL.D. (Union, 1881; Cambridge University, Eng., 1888), Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York, New York City.

Prentiss, Rev. George Lewis, D.D. (Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me., 1854), Professor of Pastoral Theology, Church Polity, and Mission Work (Presbyterian), Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Prime, Rev. Wendell, Presbyterian, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1880), Editor of *The New York Observer*, New York City.

Prugh, Rev. John Hassler, D.D. (Ursinus College, Collegeville P. O., Pa., 1893), Pastor of Grace Reformed (German) Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Purves, Rev. George Tybout, D.D. (Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., 1888), Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis, Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Princeton, N. J.

Rankin, Rev. Isaac Ogden, Presbyterian, Peekskill, N. Y.

Rankin, Rev. Jeremiah Eames, Congregationalist, D.D., LL.D. (both Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., 1869 and 1889, respectively), President of Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Reed, Rev. George Edward, Methodist Episcopal, D.D. (Wesleyan University, Middletown, Mass., 1886), LL.D. (Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 1889), President of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

Richard, Rev. James William, D.D. (Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa., 1886), Professor of Homiletics, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Richardson, Rev. Ernest Cushing, Ph.D. (Western University of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1883), Librarian of Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Riggs, Rev. James Forsyth, D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1892), Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Theological Seminary (Reformed Dutch), New Brunswick, N. J.

Roberts, Rev. William Henry, Presbyterian, D.D. (Western University of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1883), LL.D. (Miami University, Oxford, O., 1888), Philadelphia, Pa.

Rogers, Rev. Edwin Everett, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Zanesville, O.

Rogers, Rev. James William, Pastor of the Disciple Church, Walton, Kentucky.

Rossiter, Rev. Steely Bales, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1886), Pastor of the North Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Ruston, Rev. William Otis, D.D. (Lenox College, Hopkinton, Ia., 1886), Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Dubuque, Iowa.

Schaff, Rev. David Schley, D.D. (Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill., 1891), Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Jacksonville, Ill.

Schell, Rev. Edwin Allison, Methodist Episcopal, Ph.D. (Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill., 1890), D.D. (Hedding College, Abington, Ill., 1893), Secretary of the Epworth League, Chicago, Ill.

Scott, Rev. George Robert White, Congregationalist, D.D. (Middlebury College, Vt., Olivet College, Mich., both, 1884), Leominster, Mass.

Scott, Rev. Hugh McDonald, D.D. (Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., 1886), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Congregational Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Seiss, Rev. Josephus Augustus, D.D. (Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa., 1860), LL.D. (Roanoke College, Salem, Va., 1874), Pastor of the Holy Communion (Lutheran) Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Shahan, Rev. Thomas Joseph, Roman Catholic, D.D. (College of the Propaganda, Rome, 1882), Professor of Ancient Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Sheeleigh, Rev. Matthias, Lutheran, D.D. (Newberry College, Newberry, S. C., 1885), Fort Washington, Pa.

Sheldon, Rev. Henry Clay, Methodist Episcopal, D.D., (Lawrence University, Lawrence, Wis., 1887), Professor of Historical Theology, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

Sheraton, Rev. James Paterson, D.D. (Queen's University, Ontario, Canada, 1882), LL.D. (University of Toronto, Ca., 1896), Principal of Wycliffe College (Church of England), Toronto, Canada.

Shiells, Robert, Neenah, Wisconsin.

Show, Rev. Arley Barthlow, Congregationalist, Associate Professor of European History, in Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.

Small, Rev. Charles Herbert, Pastor of Congregational Church, Hudson, O.

Smith, Rev. Jonathan Ritchie, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Peekskill, N. Y.

Smith, Rev. Judson, Congregationalist, D.D. (Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., 1877), Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M., Boston, Mass.

Smith, Thomas Edward Vermilye, New York City.

Smyth, Rev. Egbert Coffin, D.D. (Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me., 1866, Harvard University,

Cambridge, Mass., 1886), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Theological Seminary (Congregational), Andover, Mass.

Spaeth, Rev. Adolph, D.D. (University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 1875), New York Professor in Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

Spieker, Rev. George Frederick, D.D. (Roanoke College, Salem, Va. 1887), Professor of Church History, Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

Stakely, Rev. Charles Averette, D.D. (Richmond College, Richmond, Va., 1889), Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C.

Steele, Rev. James Dallas, Ph.D. (University of Omaha, Neb., 1892), Pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Stevenson, Rev. Joseph Ross, Presbyterian, Adjunct Professor of Ecclesiastical History, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Storrs, Rev. Richard Salter, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1853, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., 1859), LL.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1874), L.H.D. (Columbia College, New York City, 1887), Pastor of the Church of the Pilgrims (Congregational), Brooklyn, N. Y.

Stuart, Rev. Charles Macaulay, B.D. (Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., 1883), Associate Editor of *The Northwestern Christian Advocate* (M. E.), Chicago.

Tadlock, Rev. James Doak, D.D. (Hampden Sidney College, Va., 1876), LL.D. (King College, Tenn., 1891), Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Columbia, S. C.

Taylor, Rev. William Irving, Pastor Methodist Episcopal Church, Athens, Colorado.

Terry, Rev. Roderick, D.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1882), Pastor of the South Reformed (Dutch) Church, New York City.

Thatcher, Oliver Joseph, Ph.D. (Wilmington College, Del., 1894), Associate Professor of Mediæval History, University of Chicago, Ill.

Thomas, Allen Clapp, Professor of History, Haverford College, Pa.

Thomas, Richard Henry, M.D. (University of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., 1875), Baltimore, Maryland.

Tiffany, Rev. Charles Comfort, Episcopalian, D.D. (Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 1884), Archdeacon of New York, New York City.

Tigert, Rev. John James, Methodist Episcopal, South, D.D. (Emory and Henry College, Emory, Washington Co., Va., 1888), LL.D. (University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, 1894), Editor of Books and of the *Methodist Review*, Nashville, Tenn.

Titzel, Rev. John Martin, D.D. (Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., 1852), Pastor of the First Reformed (German) Church, Lancaster, Pa.

True, Rev. Benjamin Osgood, D.D. (Rochester University, Rochester, N. Y., 1888), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Theological Seminary (Baptist), Rochester, N. Y.

Van Dyke, Rev. Paul, Pastor of the Edwards Church (Congregational), Northampton, Mass.

Vedder, Rev. Henry Clay, Profesor of Church History, Crozer Baptist Theological Seminary. Upland, Delaware Co., Pa.

Vincent, Rev. John Heyl, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, S. T. D. (Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O., 1870), LL.D. (Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., 1885), Topeka, Kansas.

Votaw, Rev. Clyde Weber, Congregationalist, Ph.D. (University of Chicago, Ill., 1896), Instructor in Biblical Greek, University of Chicago, Ill.

Walker, Williston, Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1888), S.T.D. (Adelbert College, of Western Reserve University, Adelbert, O., 1894; Amherst College, Mass., 1895), Waldo Professor of Germanic and Western Church History, Theological Seminary (Congregational), Hartford, Conn.

Warfield, Rev. Benjamin Breckinridge, D.D., LL.D. (both College

of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1880 and 1892, respectively), Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Princeton, N. J.

Weidner, Rev. Revere Franklin, D.D. (Carthage College, Carthage Ill., 1886; Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., 1894), LL.D. (Augustana College and Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill., 1894), Professor of Systematic Theology, Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Wells, Rev. Charles Luke, Episcopalian, Ph.D. (Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1893), Assistant Professor of History, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Wolf, Rev. Edmund Jacob, D.D. (Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., 1876), Professor of Church History, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Zenos, Rev. Andreas Constantinides, D.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, 1888), Professor of Biblical and Ecclesiastical History, McCormick Theological Seminary, (Presbyterian), Chicago, Ill.

Whole number 160

Life Members 6

DECEASED MEMBERS

From the Organization of the Society, March 23, 1888, to December 31, 1896, chronologically arranged according to the dates of their deaths.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

REUTER, HERMANN FERDINAND, Sept. 18, 1889.

HATCH, EDWIN, Nov. 10, 1889.

BERSIER, EUGENE, Nov. 19, 1889.

LIGHTFOOT, JOSEPH BARBER, Dec. 21, 1889.

HASE, KARL AUGUST VON, Jan. 3, 1890.

KURTZ, JOHANN HEINRICH, April 26, 1890.

PRESSENSÉ, EDMOND DEHAULT DE, April 8, 1891.

CASPARI, CARL PAUL, April 11, 1892.

MEMBERS.

SCHWAB, GUSTAV, August 22, 1888.

MOFFAT, JAMES CLEMENT, June 7, 1890.

DEXTER, HENRY MARTYN, Nov. 13, 1890.

BENNETT, CHARLES WESLEY, April 17, 1891.

HUIDEKOPER, FREDERIC, May 16, 1892.

MANN, WILLIAM JULIUS, June 20, 1892.

SHEPARD, ELLIOTT FITCH, March 24, 1893.

ROSS, ABEL HASTINGS, May 13, 1893.

SCHAFF, PHILIP, Oct. 20, 1893.

CHILDS, GEORGE WASHINGTON, Feb. 3, 1894.

JAY, JOHN, May 5, 1894.

FOX, LOUIS RODMAN, Dec. 21, 1894.

RHOADS, JAMES E., Jan. 2, 1895.

DOUGLASS, FREDERICK, Feb. 20, 1895.

CHAMBERS, TALBOT WILSON, Feb. 3, 1896.

INDEX.

A

Aachen, Council of, accepts Dionysian code, 225.
Abælard's "Sic et Non," 181.
Act of Uniformity, 68.
Acta of the Classis of Amsterdam, 86.
Adam, Thomas, on deviation of Methodism from Church of England, 176.
Adams, John, on Ecclesiastical situation in New England prior to Revolution, 77.
Adams, Samuel, on protestant Episcopacy in America, 1768, 67; nominates Episcopal Chaplain, 77.
Adger, Dr., leads opposition to terms of union between Old and New School Presbyterians of the South, 35, 36.
Adopting Act of 1729, 20, 26.
"Ad res exteras," 85.
Adrian II, approves decrees of Troyes, 259, 260,
Aggar, Lettice, 112.
"Albany Records," 89.
Alcuin, on classical studies, 190; Christian grammar, 193.
Alexander, W. A. See Literature, United Synod, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.
Allen, Mr., of Dedham, 121
American and Foreign Christian Union, 25.
American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 7.
American Education Society, 7.
Ames, William, 267.
Ammianus Marcellinus, disapproval of Julian's Edict, 183.
Amsterdam, Classis of, its importance, 84, 85; archives of, 86, 90 *sq*, 101, 106. See Amsterdam Correspondence.
Amsterdam Correspondence, 81 *sq*, 90 *sq*; American church given possession of, 93; uses put to, 94 *sq*; efforts to make it accessible, 96 *sq*; in hands of stated clerk of General Synod, 97; in Sage library, 98; partially translated, 98; indexed, 99; additional discoveries, 100; frustrated efforts at new translation, 102; further efforts to secure balance of correspondence and to publish complete work, 103 *sq*.
Andros, Sir Edmund, 68.
Anglo-Saxons, Conversion of, 224.
Anselm of Bec, on classical studies, 188.
"Anthology of New Netherland," 95.
Apiarus, case of not important, 220, 221.
Apollinaris Sidonius, gives up classical studies, etc., 185.
"Apostolical Constitutions," opposes classical studies, 182.
Appellate Jurisdiction of Roman See. See Roman See.
Apthorp, East, pamphlet in defense of Society for Propagating Gospel, 75.
Aquinas, Thomas, Rosmini on, 44, denial of Immaculate Conception, 60; on Transubstantiation, 60, 61; importance attached to by Roman Church, 62.
"Archives of New Jersey," 103.
Aristotle, Rosmini on, 43.
Arles, vicariate of, 217.
Arnobius, opposes study of classics, 182.
Arnold of St. Emmeran, on classical studies, 191.
Arsenius, papal legate, 251.
Augustine, influence on mediæval thought, 182; on classical studies, 184, 185.
Augustine, missionary to Anglo-Saxons, 224.

B

Baird, E. T., on Committee of Conference with United Synod Committee, 30; opposes doctrinal declaration, 35.
Baird, S. J. See Literature United Synod Presbyterian Church United States of America.
Bancroft's estimate of Indian population in 1675, 143.
Baptista, neutral or divided politics in New England prior to the Revolution, 69.
Barbadoes, Friends in, 266.
Basil, favors classical studies, 183.
Basilides, appeals to Rome, 211.
Bede, Venerable, on education, 187; Christian grammar, 193.
Beecher, Lyman, Pelagian teaching of, 9; reply to Porter, 9, 10.
Beekman, Gerard, on Committee to secure documents of Dutch church, 105.
Benedict, rule for study, 185.
Benedict III, confirms decrees of Soissons synod, 245, 246.
Beneset, Anthony, 272–274; treatise on slavery, 288, 292, "Caution to Great Britain," 294.
Beyaert, Pieter, 157.
Bibliography United Synod, Presbyterian Church, 3.
Billia, Prof., on Rosmini, 58.
Bishops, classical studies of in early and mediæval church, 185.
Bohemia Manor 157, 159.
Boniface, relation to classical instruction, 187; important work in developing prerogatives of Roman See, 225, 235 *sq*; attack on his metropolitan system, 257, system doomed, 259.
Bourne, Richard, 139; salary, 139.
Bownas, Samuel, on Labadists, 153.
Boyd, A. H. H., Private letters to, 5; at convention of Southern Presbyterians, 1857, 16, 17; at first assembly United Synod, 19; views on Atonement, 28; designated professor of proposed New School seminary, 37.
Boyle, Sir Robert, 83, 125.
Bradford, Gov., "History" quoted, 115.
Bray, Thomas, 71.
Breckenridge, R. J., opposed to union with southern Presbyterians, 17, 27; unjustifiable representation of New School party, 29.
Brethren of Charity, Institute of, 41.
Brevint's eucharistical volume quoted by Wesley, 164.
Brodhead, J. Romeyn, agent to collect official documents in Europe, 89; use made of Amsterdam correspondence, 94; death, 97.
Brower, William L., on committee to secure records of Dutch Church, 105.
Brown, William, on committee of conference with United Synod Committee, 30.
Brownlee, William C., "Magazine of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church," 88.
Bruno, Archbishop, influence on classical studies, 189.
Burling, William, 273, 282.

C

Cæsarius of Arles, rules for study, 185.
Callistus, 209.
Cambridge synod, Eliot preaches to Indians before, 123.
Caner, Dr. rector King's chapel, 70.
Canon of Carthage. See Carthage.
Canons. See Councils.
Carothers, A. G. See Literature United Synod, Presbyterian Church.
Carthage Fourth Council of, on classical studies of bishops, 185; canon 10, of Council of, A.D. 401, at, 248.
Cassian, on classical studies, 185.
Cassiodorus, influence on classical studies, 186.
"Centennial Discourses of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America," 99.
"Central Presbyterian," 4.
Chambers, T. W., translates minutes of the Coetus etc., 96; on committee of co-operation, 98; requests Index of Dutch translations, etc for Collegiate Church library, 99; "Church in the Colonial period," 99; translates minutes of Collegiate church of New York, 99; on committee of custody of records, 101.
Charlemagne, influence on classical studies, 187, 189; opposed to papal pretensions, 225; empire and church under, 232, 233, 238.
Charles the Bald, 241, 242, 249, 253; dissatisfied with findings of Council of Troyes, 258.

Charles the Great. See Charlemagne.
Charter, Colonial of Massachusetts, 68.
"Christian Intelligencer," 89, 94, 95, 99.
"Church in the Colonial Period," 99.
Church, Western, attitude of towards the study of the Latin classics in the early Middle Ages. See Latin classics.
Churchman, John, 284.
Clarkson, Thomas, on Benezet, 274.
Classics, Latin. See Latin classics.
"Clear Sunshine, The," 124.
Clement, St., implied supremacy of Roman See, 202, 203; subordination of bishops to Church indicated, 208.
Clovis, opposition to Rome, 224.
Cluny, centre of opposition to classical studies, 192.
Cockenöe, Indian teacher of Eliot, 116.
Coe, E. B., address at the Bi-centennial of the Charter of the Reformed Dutch Church in New York, 94; on committee to secure documents, etc., 104, 105.
Coetus of Dutch Church, 87.
Cole, David, on committee to secure documents of Dutch Church, 105.
Colonial Charter of Massachusetts, 68.
"Colonial Documents relating to the State of New York," 90, 102, 106.
Committee of Co-operation, Dutch Church, 98.
"Complaint against Frelinghuysen," 98.
Congregationalism among New School Presbyterians, 7; maintained by public law, 68; Whitefield on the established nature of, 72; struggle against Episcopal propagandism, 73; Hobart controversy, 73, 74; Mayhew Controversy, 75, 76. See New England, etc.
Congregationalists head and front of revolutionary party, 69; number of churches in 1760, 70. See Congregationalism, New England, etc.
Connecticut, General Association of, 7; Episcopal propagandism in, 72, 73; work among Indians in, 139.
Constantinople, against Rome, 215, 216.
Contractus, Hermannus, classical student, 190.
Convention of 1857, of Southern Presbyterians, 15 *sq.*
Cooper, Jacob 98.
Corwin, E. T., "Manual of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church," 96; on committee to secure translations, 98; efforts to secure letters discovered by Hoes, 100, 101; on committee to secure documents, 103, 104.
Cotton, John, Jr., assists Eliot in translation of Bible, 134; missionary work, 139.
Council of Aachen, 225; fourth General of Carthage, 185; of A.D. 401 at Carthage, 248; first German, 236; of Soissons, 245; of Thionville, 241; of Troyes, 257–259.
Coykendall, S. D., on committee to secure documents of Dutch Church, 105.
Cromwell, Oliver, plan for universal diffusion of Christianity, 125.
Cunningham, Rev. Mr., on committee of General Assembly Old School Presbyterians to confer with United Synod, 26.
Cutler, Dr., of Christ Church, Boston, on necessity of communion with Episcopal Church, 72.
Cuts-ha-ma-kim, Indian sachem, 121.
Cyprian, views on Episcopacy and Roman prerogatives, 209; case of Marcian of Arles, 210; denounces Stephen, 212.

D

Dabney, R. L., on A. H. H. Boyd, 28; on committee of conference with United Synod committee, 30; speech before the committees, 31; author of doctrinal statement there presented, 31, 35. See Literature United Synod.
Damasus, episcopal privileges given to, by Gratian, 215, 222.
Damiani, Peter, on classical studies, 191.
Danish East India Company, 85.
Danish-Halle mission at Tranquebar, 85.
Dankers, Jasper, Labadist missionary, 155 *sq.*
Davidson, Thomas, on Rosmini, 42.
"Day Breaking," 124.
de Bruyn, Van Troostenburg, work on Dutch missionaries in East Indies, 86.
Declaration of Principles (of United Synod), 20 *sq.*

Decretals. See Roman See.
Decretals, Pseudo-Isidorean. See Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals.
Deer Island, Indians removed to, 142.
"Defense against the Church," of Rartan, 98.
De Labadie, founder of Labadism, 152, 154, 155.
Demarest, David D., "History and Characteristics of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church," 96; on seminary faculty, 98; on committee to secure publication of correspondence, 104.
Demarest, William, engaged to translate Dutch minutes, etc., 96.
DeWitt, John, 98.
DeWitt, Thomas, 90–92; attempt to retain possession of Amsterdam correspondence, 93; "Succinct History," 94; other works, 95; thanks of the synod, 97; death, 97.
"Dialogue between Considerans and Candidus," 98.
Dionysius, epistles show subordination of episcopacy to Church, 208.
Dionysius Exiguus, codification of law, 223; authoritative in Frankish Church, 225; appealed to by Hincmar, 256, 257.
"Distinctive Principles of the Presbyterian Church," etc. See Literature United Synod.
Dittleback on the Labadists, 153, 154.
"Documentary History of the State of New York," 90, 95, 106.
Documents, Contemporary, value of, 81 *sq.*; 105, 106.
"Documents relating to the Colonial History of the State of New York," 90, 102, 106.
Domestic and Foreign Missionary Board of the United Synod, 22.
Domestic Missionary Society of Hanover and Piedmont Presbyteries, 22.
Donatist schism, 220.
Dorchester Mills, Eliot's sermon at, 118.
Dort, Synod of, 84; instructions for missionaries, 84.
Druillette, Gabriel, Jesuit missionary, 140.
Dudley, village of praying Indians, 144.
Duffield, George, Pelagian doctrine, 9.
Du Lignon, P., catechism of Labadism, 150.
Dunning, H. See Literature United Synod.
Dunster, President, of Harvard College, 121.
Dutch Church. See Reformed Church, Amsterdam, Classis of, Amsterdam Correspondence.
Dutch East India Company, 85.
Dutch Jurisprudence, 87.

E

East India Company, Danish, 85.
East India Company, Dutch, 85.
East India Company, English, 85.
Easter question, second century, 205, 209.
Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, 240 *sq.*; case reopened, 254 *sq.*, 257, 258.
Edmunds, Edwin, agitates for union with Old School Presbyterians, 29.
Edmundson, William, visits West Indies, 264, 265.
Eliot, Bennett, 112.
Eliot, John, 111, *sq.*; new light on mission, 111; early life, 111 *sq.*; sails for America, 113; at Roxbury, 114; characteristics, 114, 115; work among Indians, 115 *sq.*; first sermon to Indians, 118; at Nonantum, 118 *sq.*; at Neponset, 121; in other places, 121; results, 122, 123, 138, 139; Shepard's testimony, 123, preaches to Indians before Synod, 123; appeals to England, 124, 125; funds donated, 125; large plans, 126; Natick settled, 126 *sq.*; plan of government, 128, 129; other communities, 129, 130; Indian churches, 131, 132; translation of Bible, 133 *sq.*; its great value, 135; efforts with Mohegans and Narragansetts, 136, 137; King Philip's war, 137, 138, 141, 142; perilous journeys, 137, 138; salaries, 114, 139; entertains Father Druillette, 140; probably mistaken policies, 141; defense of Christian Indians, 142; Indians removed to Deer Island, 142; to Cambridge, 143; return to Natick, 143; reasons for lack of final success, 143, 144; work of latest years, 144; death, family, and books, 145.
Eliot, Mrs. John, 114, 145.
Eliot, John, Jr., 130.
Elmendorf, Joachim, on Committee to secure documents of Dutch Church, 105.
Endicott, Governor, praises Indians 128, 129.

English East India Company, 85.
Episcopacy in New England prior to the Revolution, 67 *sq.*; freedom from political entanglements in Virginia, 69; moral looseness of colonial clergy in Virginia, 70; number and influence of churches in New England in 1748, 70, 72; established in Maryland, 71; propagandism in Connecticut, 72; Hobart controversy, 73; "Vindication" of Wetmore, 74; Mayhew controversy, 75, 76.
Episcopate, Rosmini's views on, 54 *sq.*; importance of rise of, in the development of the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Roman See, 208 *sq.*; effect of Donatist schism on, 220.
"Evocatio," 254.
Exiguus, Dionysius, 223.

F

Finney, Pelagian doctrine of, 9.
Fitch, James, 138.
Flodoardus, on Nicholas I., 245.
Fothergill, Samuel, visits meetings of Friends, 284.
Fowler, "Constitutional and Legal History of New York" referred to, 87.
Fox, George, on slavery, 263 *sq.*, 273.
Franks, empire of. See Charlemagne, Hincmar, Roman See, etc.
Freeman's "Verdegiging," 98.
Frelinghuysen, Frederick, on Committee to secure records of Dutch Church, 105.
Friends, tolerated in America, 68; neutral or divided politically prior to Revolution, 69; protest against legal establishment of Episcopacy in Maryland, 71; attitude toward slavery in the 17th and 18th centuries, 263 *sq.*; attempt to stop their missionary work in Barbadoes, 265, 266; Penn on slavery, 266; protest of German Friends against slavery, 267; result, 268; Keith on slavery, 268; action of 1696, 269; of Chester Quarterly meetings, 269 *sq.*; letters to London Friends and replies, 269 *sq.*; actions of 1730–1754, Philadelphia meeting, 272; activity of Southby against slavery, 273, 274; of Sandiford, 274; of Lay and Benezet, 274; of Woolman, 275, 276; importance of Philadelphia meeting of 1758, 276; of 1774, 277; final judgment against slavery, 277; first action in New England Yearly meeting, 278; other early actions, 278; visit of Woolman, 278, 279; progress of work against slavery in New England, 279 *sq.*; success, 281; action in New York, 282, 283; in Maryland, 283 *sq.*; in southern states, 287 *sq.*; legal difficulties concerning manumission in North Carolina, 291; action in England, 292 *sq.*; "Printed Epistle," 292, 293; petition against slave trade, 293, 294; "Meeting for Sufferings," 294; Germantown Friends' Protest against slavery, 295 *sq.*; Bibliography, 297 *sq.*

G

Gandersheim, centre of culture, 189.
Gelasius, supremacy of Roman See, 222, 223; decretal "de libris recipiendis," 225.
General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, New School. See Literature United Synod.
General Association of Connecticut, 7.
German, First Council, 236.
Gervin, St., rescued from heathen authors, 191.
Gillet, Ezra Hall. See Literature United Synod.
"Glorious Progress of the Gospel," 124.
Gookin, Major, probably at Nonantim with Eliot, 118, 121; quoted, 127; superintendent Indian reservations, 129; accounts of visits, 129, 130; official tour with Eliot, 138; testimony to faithfulness of Christian Indians, 141, 142; devotion to them, 143.
Gratian gives Damasus episcopal privileges, 215, 222
Gratian's "Concordantia Canonum Discordantium," 181, 194.
Gregory Nazianzen, favors classical studies, 183.
Gregory the Great, on classical studies, 186.
Gregory IV, papal powers in France, 239.
Griffith, John, anti-slavery advocate, 288.
Gunn's "Life of Dr. John H. Livingston," 88.
Gunther of Cologne, 251.

H

Hadriano-Dionysian Code. See Dionysian code.
Hale, Sir Matthew, modus vivendi of 1668, 68.
Halinard, archbishop of Lyons, classical student, 189.
Hall, Westley, Wesley's letter to, 171.
Hammond, John, on colonial Virginia clergy, 70.
Hampden-Sidney college, 25.
Hansen, Maurice G., appointed translator of Dutch works, 98.
Harbaugh, Henry, "Fathers of the Reformed Church in Europe and America," 95; "Life of Rev. Michael Schlatter," 96.
Harinulf, biographer of St. Gervin, on classical studies, 191.
Hartranft, C. D., 98.
Hassa-na-messett, Indian church at, 132.
Hays, George P. See Literature United Synod.
Heath, Mr., of Puritan colony, 121.
Hegel, Rosmini on, 45.
Hereford, bishop of, on number of Episcopal churches in America, 70.
Herrmann, Augustine, 156, 157, 158.
Herrman, Ephraim, 156, 157.
Hermannus Contractus, classical student, 190.
Hilary of Arles, 221.
Hilary, pope, vicariate in Gaul, 223.
Hincmar, accepts Pseudo Isidore decretals, 226, 260; champion Gallican church, 233, 234, 242; power, 241; honor of extraordinary pallium, 242; case of Ebbo, 243, *sq.*, 254 *sq.*; Benedict III. commends him, 245; relation to Nicholas I., 246 *sq.*; iron rule, 246; case of Rothadus, 247 *sq.*; appeals to Sardican canons, 248; council of Soissons, 249; high-handed action, 250; defiance of Nicholas, 253; reopens case of Ebbo, 255; victory, 255, 256; correspondence with Nicholas concerning legality of council, 256, 257; council of Troyes, 257, 258; appealed to by Nicholas for aid in Greek controversy, 258; refutes Hincmar of Laon, 260.
Hincmar of Laon, 246, 256, 259, 260.
Hippolytus on Callistus, 209.
Historical Commission of New Jersey, 103.
Historical Society, New York, 89, 95.
"History and Character of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church," 96.
Hobart, Noah, on Episcopal converts, 72; controversy, 73.
Hoes, Roswell Randall, discoverer of portion of Amsterdam correspondence, 100, 103, 104.
Hoge, Dr., supports doctrinal declaration at conference between Old and New School Presbyterians South, 35.
Hooker, Thomas, influence on John Eliot, 113.
Hopkins, influence of, 9.
Hutchinson, Gov., on popular discontent in Massachusetts, 1774, 67, 69.

I

Idea, defined by Rosmini, 52.
Ideal Being. See Rosmini.
Ideas, origin of. See Rosmini.
Ignatius, belief in supremacy of Roman church, 204.
Immaculate Conception, Rosmini on, 60.
Independency. See Congregationalism.
Indians, missions to. See Eliot, John; Gookin. Major,
Ingelheim, pseudo synod at, 241, 243.
Innocent I. claims Peter as sole apostle to the West, 219.
Irenæus, on Polycarp's journey to Rome, 205; disputed reading of his famous passage, 206, 207.
Isidore of Seville, on classical studies, 186.

J

Jackson, Edward, of Puritan colony, 121.
Jackson, Isaac, on slavery, 275.
Jackson, W. H., on committee to secure Dutch records, 105.
Jerome, influence on mediæval thought, 182; on classical studies, 183 *sq.*
Jesuits opposed to Rosmini's teachings, 56, 57.
John III., 224.
John, archbishop of Ravenna, 251.
Johnson, Thomas Carey, letter of Rev. P. B. Price to, 5.

Johnston, J. F., on committee to confer with committee of Presbyterian church in the Confederate States of America, 30.
Julian, edict of, 183.
Jurisdiction of the Roman See. See Roman See.
Justin Martyr, tendency of, 182.

K

Kalm, Swedish traveller, on Quaker slaveholding, 274, 275.
Kalopothakes, Mr., foreign missionary of United Synod, 25.
Kant, Rosmini on, 45, 46, 48, 49.
Keith, George, on slavery, 268.
King's Chapel, Boston, 68, 70.
Kirk, W. H., on committee to secure documents for Dutch Church, 103.
Kirkpatrick, T. J., agitates for union with New School Presbyterians, 29, 35.
Kock, John, 150.
"Klagte," 98.
Krickaard, A., on committee to secure documents for Dutch Church, 103.

L

Labadist Colony in Maryland, 149 *sq.*; character of Labadism, 149; radical wing of Voetian party, 150; catechism of Du Lignon, 150; customs, 151 *sq.*; system of faith, 152 *sq.*; settlement, 155 *sq.*; extinction, 155; reasons, 159, 160.
Lactantius, favors classical studies, 182.
Lanfranc of Bec, discourages use of classics, 192.
Langen, opinion on Polycarp's journey to Rome, 205.
Lansing, J. Townsend, on committee to secure records of Dutch Church, 105.
Latin classics, attitude of Western Church towards study of in early Middle Ages, 181 *sq.*; influence of early fathers, 182; of Jerome and Augustine, 183; Fourth Council of Carthage on, 185; influence of Apollinaris, Cassian, Benedict, Cæsarius, Cassiodorus, Gregory, and Isidore, 185, 186; reasons for change of views in period A.D. 800–1100, 187; liberal spirit opposed and why, 188; chief advocates of classical culture, 189; monasteries centres of culture, 189; Alcuin, Otloh of Friesling, Arnold of St. Emmeran, St. Gervin, Harinulf, Peter Damiani, Ouen quoted, 190, 191; Cluny, 192; political aspect of controversy, 192; Christian grammars, 193; failure of opposition to classical learning, 193, 194; Gratian's conclusions, 194.
Lay, Benjamin, 274.
Lay investiture, 55.
Leibnitz, Rosmini on, 44.
Leo the Great, on Petrine prerogatives, 222.
Leo IV., honors to Hincmar, 242; case of Ebbo, 244, 245.
Leo XIII., confirms decree condemning Rosmini's propositions, 57; criticised, 58, 59.
Leontius of Arles, 223.
Lexington, presbytery of, on slavery, 14.
Leydt, pamphlets of, 98.
Lievin, Irish apostle, 189.
"Life of Rev. Michael Schlatter," 95.
Literature, United Synod, Presbyterian Church, 3 *sq.*
Locke, Rosmini on, 44.
Lothair I., 241, 242, 245.
Lott, George, on committee to secure documents for Dutch Church, 103.
Louis the Debonair. See Louis the Mild.
Louis the German, 242.
Louis the Mild, 238 *sq.*; influence on classical studies, 188.
Louis the Pious. See Louis the Mild.
Lupus, Servatus, classical student, 189.
Lutheran churches, operate through Danish East India Co., 85.

M

Majolus, abbot, on Virgil, 192.
Malebranche, resemblance of views to Rosmini's, 50.
Mallary, E. Payson, on the Labadists, 159.
"Manual of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church," 96, 97, 99.
Marcellinus, Ammianus, disapproval of Julian's Edict, 183.
Marcian of Arles, appeal to Stephen, 210.
Marcion, 205.
Marshall, M. M., on United Synod Committee to confer with Old School Assembly Committee, 22.

Martien, William E. S., publisher "The Presbyterian," 4.
Maryland, legal establishment of episcopacy in, 71.
Maryville College, Tenn., 25.
Mashpee, church organized at, 140.
Massachusetts, popular discontent in, in 1774, 67; Colonial charter of, 68; in See of London, 72; work among Indians in, 115. See Eliot, John; New England, etc.
Massachusetts Indians. See Eliot, John.
Mather, Cotton, on John Eliot, 115.
Mather, Increase, opposition of, to Episcopacy, 69.
Mather, Richard, 121.
Mayhew, Jonathan, on Episcopacy in New England prior to Revolution, 72; "Controversy," 73, 75, 76.
Mayhew, Thomas, Indian missionary, 117, 139; salary, 139.
Maynard, Horace, presiding officer of convention of Southern Presbyterians, 1857, 15.
Maurus, Rabanus, on classical studies, 189.
Meinwerk, Bishop, influence on classical studies, 189.
Methodism, relation of, to Church of England. See Wesley, John.
Methodists, neutral or divided politically in New England, prior to the Revolution, 69.
Metropolitans. See Boniface; Nicholas I.; Roman See, etc.
Michaelius, Jonas, 95.
Miller, Samuel, quoted, 9.
Ministry Act, 107.
"Minutes of General Synod," 96.
"Minutes of the Presbyterian Church South." See Literature United Synod.
"Minutes of the Synod of Virginia." See Literature United Synod.
"Minutes of the United Synod," etc. See Literature United Synod.
Missionary Society of Hanover and Piedmont Presbyteries, 22.
Mississippi, synod of, in 1859, 24.
Mitchell, Arthur, disciple of Edwards A. Park, 29.
Mitchell, J. D., recommends use of term synod, 18; preaches at opening Assembly of United Synod, 19; inconsistent preaching, 28; on committee to confer with committee of Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, 30.
Mohegans. See Eliot, John.
Monks, classical studies of, 185.
Moore, William E. See Literature United Synod.
Mumford, Hannah, wife of John Eliot, 144, 145.
Murphy, Henry C., "The Anthology New Netherlands," 95; letter of Michaelius, 95; translation of journal of Sluyter and Dankers, 156.

N

Narragansetts. See Eliot, John.
Nashaway, Eliot's journeys to, 137.
Natick, Mass., settled as Indian town, 126 *sq.*; first Indian Church at, 132; removed from, 142; return to, 143; village of praying Indians, 144.
Nelson, William, on committee to secure documents of Dutch Church, 105.
Neponset, Eliot's work at, 121, 130.
Nesutan, Job, Indian interpreter, 117.
Nevin, Alfred. See Literature United Synod.
New England, ecclesiastical situation in, prior to the Revolution, 67 *sq.*; Congregational and Episcopal forces compared, 70; Society for the Propagating of the Gospel, 71, 72, 75; Hobart controversy, 73; "Vindication" of Wetmore, 74; Mayhew controversy, 75, 76; meaning of struggle with Episcopacy, 77; its end, 77. See Congregationalism, etc. For work among the Indians in, see Eliot, John.
New Jersey, archives of, 103.
New Jersey, Historical Commission of, 103.
New School. See Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, New School.
New York Historical Society, 89, 95.
Newby, Thomas, frees slaves, 290.
Newman, John Henry, contrasted with Wesley, 169.
Nicholas I., pontificate of, develops doctrine of appelate jurisdiction of Roman See, 198, 226, 233, 234; peculiar construction given to confirmation of Benedict III., 245; confirms Hincmar's privileges, 246, case of Rothadus, 246 *sq.*; restores him, 251, 253; humbles Thietgard and Gunther, 251; John, archbishop of Ravenna, 251; Pseudo-

Isidorean decretals, 252; case of Ebbo reopened, 254 *sq.*; beaten by Hincmar, 256; council of Troyes, 257, 258; Greek controversy, 258; asks Hincmar's aid, 258; death, 258.
Nicholson, Thomas, "Liberty and Property," 290.
Nonantum, Eliot's sermon at, 118; later efforts at, 120, 121; town settled, 123; becomes too small, 126.
North Holland, synod of, 84, 104, 106.
Notker of St. Gall, on Prudentius, 193.

O

Odo, abbot of Clugny, opinion of Virgil, 192.
Old School. See Presbyterian Church in the United States, Old School.
Opatus, scheme of, a prophecy, 220.
Origen, recommends study of classics, 182.
Origin of Ideas. See Rosmini.
Otloh of Freising, on classical studies, 190.
Otto the Great, influence on classical studies, 187, 189.
Ouen, St., opposed to classical studies, 191.

P

Pakemitt, Mass., Eliot's work at, 130.
Pakonoket Indians, 126, 136. See Eliot, John.
Palmer, B. M., on committee of General Assembly Old School to confer with committee of United Synod, 26, 35, 36.
Papacy. See Hincmar; Nicholas I.; Roman See, etc.
Paschasius Radbertus, 232.
Pawtucket, Eliot's work at, 121, 130, 144.
Pelagianism in New School party, Presbyterian Church, 9.
Penn, William, on slavery, 266.
Perrone, on Rosmini, 41, 42.
Peter Damiani, on classical studies, 191.
Philip, King, war, 137, 138, 141; its fatal character, 144.
Pierson, Abraham, 139.
Pius IX., relation to Rosmini, 53, 56 *sq.*
Plan of Union of 1801, 7; abrogated, 10.
Plato, Rosmini on, 43.
Polycarp, resorts to Rome, 205.
Porter, charge against Lyman Beecher, 9.
"Position, Relation, and Prospects of the United Synod," etc. See Literature United Synod.
"Presbyterian, The," 4.
Presbyterian Church South, Minutes of the, 5.
Presbyterian Church in the United States, 6. See Southern Presbyterian Church.
Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. See Southern Presbyterian Church.
Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, New School, 6, 7; reasons of split, 7 *sq.*; after split, 11; question of slavery, 12 *sq.* See United Synod.
Presbyterian Church in the United States, Old School, 6, 7; reasons of split, 7, *sq.*; in 1837, 10; relations to Southern Convention of 1857, 16; to United Synod, 21, 22, 26. See Southern Presbyterian Church.
Presbyterians, neutral or divided politically in New England prior to Revolution, 69.
Preston, J. T. L., agitates for union with New School Presbyterians, 29; on committee of conference with United Synod Committee, 30, 36.
Price, B. P., Secretary Board of Missions, United Synod, 25. See Literature United Synod.
Prins, Rev. Mr., Stated Clerk of the Classis of Amsterdam, 90, 93.
Promoting Christian Knowledge, Society for, 83.
Propagation of Gospel in Foreign Parts, Society for the, American controversies, 71, 72, 75; value of records, 83.
Propagating the Gospel in New England, Society for, 82, 83, 125, 134.
Prudentius, 193.
Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals, 225, 232, 234, 242, 243, 252, 254, 259, 260.
Purchase Quarterly Meeting, on slavery, 282.
Puritans. See Congregationalism; New England, etc. For work among Indians, see Eliot, John.

Q

Quaboag, Eliot's journey to, 137.
Quakers. See Friends.
Quedlinberg, centre of culture, 189.

R

Rabanus Maurus, on classical studies, 189.
Radbertus, Paschasius, 232, 239.
Ramsey, J. B., on committee of conference with United Synod committee, 30.
Read, Charles H., at convention of 1857 of Southern Presbyterians, 16; at first assembly United Synod, 19, 22; on committee to confer with committee of Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, 30.
Reckitt, anti-slavery advocate, 288.
Reformed Church in America, 87; authorizes DeWitt to have translation made of Amsterdam correspondence, 91; uses of correspondence, 94 *sq.*, 99; Demarest's work, 96; Corwin's, 96; other documents, 96, 97; records and correspondence transferred to Sage library, 97, Amsterdam correspondence translated, 97 *sq.*; committee of cooperation, 98; indexed, 99; additional material discovered, 98, 100. See Amsterdam Correspondence.
"Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, History and Character of the," 96.
"Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, Manual of the," 96.
Reid, Rosmini on, 44.
Reserves, right of, 55.
Rhode Island, work among the Indians in, 139.
Rigbad, on classical studies, 189.
Riggs, J. F., on committee to secure documents for Reformed Dutch Church, 103.
Ritzema, pamphlets of, 98.
Robinson, J. J., president Maryville College, Tennessee, 25; on committee to confer with committee of Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, 30.
Roman Catholic protest against legal establishment of Episcopacy in Maryland, 71.
Roman Church, the four important propositions regarding, 235. See Roman See, and titles at end of it.
Roman See, development of the Appellate Jurisdiction of the, 197 *sq.*; doctrine developed in its fulness in pontificate of Nicholas I., 198, 226; its importance, 199, 200; its three periods of development, 200 *sq.*; in first century, 201, 213; close of second, 203, 213; testimony of Ignatius, 204; of Polycarp. 205; church, not bishop, the power, 205, 206; testimony of Irenæus and Tertullian, 206, 207, 209; importance of rise of Episcopate, 208 *sq.*, 213; Cyprian, 209; case of Marcian of Arles, 210; of Basilides, 211; growth of papal power, 212; influence of synods, 212, 213; establishment of Christianity as religion of empire a danger to power of See, 213, 214; limitations of the system, 214 *sq.*; council of Sardica, 216; vicariates of Arles and Thessalonica, 217; maternity of Roman Church, 217, 218; Petrine prerogatives, 218, 219; Donatist schism, 220; case of Apiarus, 220, 221; of Hilary of Arles, 221; strong position of Leo the Great, 222, 223; third period of development, 222 *sq.*; barbarian invasion the Church's opportunity, 223, 224; cases of Salonius and Sagittarius, 224; conversion of Anglo-Saxons, 224; labors of Boniface, 225; Pseudo-Isidorean decretals, 225; Dionysian code, authoritative in Frankish Church, 225. See Ebbo; Hincmar; Louis the Mild; Nicholas I.; Pseudo Isidore; Rothad of Soissons.
Romeyn, Dirck, sketch of Dutch Church in America, 88.
Ross, Frederick A., at convention of 1857 of Southern Presbyterians, 16; at first assembly of United Synod, 19; Arminianism, 28.
Rosmini, Antonio, teachings of, 41 *sq.*; their comprehensiveness, 42; relation to Plato and Aristotle, 43; to schoolmen, 43, 44, 53, 54; to Locke, 44; to Reid, 44; to Liebnitz, 44; to Kant, 45, 46, 48, 49; to Hegel, 45; origin of ideas, 46 *sq.*; relation of ideal being to God, 49, 50; resemblance to Malebranche, 50; criticism of views, 50 *sq.*; definition of sensation, 52; of sense perception, 52; of idea, 52; ecclesiastical views, 53 *sq.*; condemned, 56 *sq.*; Jesuits opposed to his philosophy, 56, 57; Leo XIII. approves condemnation, 57; alleged pantheism of, 58, 59; on immaculate conception, 60; transubstantiation, 60, 61; seeming monothelitism of, 62; on beatific vision, 62.

Roswitha, attempt to supplant Terrence, 193.
Rothad of Soissons, 198, 211, 226, 246; accusation, 247; appeal to Rome, 247, 248; condemned at Soissons, 249; released, 249; high-handed action of Hincmar, 250; at Rome, 250; restored by Nicholas, 251 *sq.*; self-stultification, 257.
Roxbury, Mass., Eliot's ministry at, 114 *sq.*; conditions then, 124.
Rufinus, opposes Jerome in views regarding classical studies, 183.

S

Sagittarius, appeal to John III., 224.
St. Gall, centre of culture, 189.
Salonius, appeal to John III., 224.
Samuel, Indian teacher, 130.
Sandiford, Ralph, 273, 274.
Sardica, council of, importance exaggerated, 216; allows appeal to Rome, 248; appealed to by Hincmar, 248.
"Schlatter, Life of Rev. Michael," 96.
Scholte, Rev. Mr., of Utrecht, 93.
Schoolmen, Rosmini on, 44, 53, 54.
Secker, Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, on colonial episcopacy, 75.
Segnini, on Rosmini, 42.
Sensation, defined by Rosmini, 52.
Sense perception defined by Rosmini, 52.
Serbati, Antonio Rosmini. See Rosmini.
Servatus Lupus, classical student, 189.
Shepard, Thomas, at Nonantum with Eliot, 118, 121; testimony to value of work, 123.
"Shepherd of Hermas," 203.
Sichirollo, on Rosmini, 42, 59.
Sidonius, Apollinaris, gives up classical studies on becoming a bishop, 185.
Slavery. See Friends; Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, New School.
Sluyter Peter, superintendent of Labadists, 153–155 *sq.*
Smaragdus, Christian grammar, 193.
Smith, J. C. See Literature United Synod.
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 83.
Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, American controversies, 71, 72, 75; value of records, 83.
Society for the Propagation of Gospel in New England, 82, 83, 125, 134.
Soissons, council at, condemning Rothadus, 249; synod at, A.D. 853, 245; A.D. 866, 257.
Soter of Rome, epistle of, implying supremacy of Roman See, 203.
South Holland, Synod of, 104, 106.
Southby, William, 273.
Southern Presbyterian Church, 6; proposed union with United Synod, 29 *sq.*; doctrinal declaration, 32, 35, 37; takes in United Synod, 36, 38.
"Southern Presbyterian," attacks Dabney's doctrinal statement, 31.
"Southern Presbyterian Review," See Literature United Synod.
Spring resolutions, 27
Stephen, Pope, appealed to in case of Marcian of Arles, 210; denounced by Cyprian, 212.
Stiles, J. C., at Convention of 1857 of Southern Presbyterians, 16; chosen professor of theology of theological seminary United Synod, 25; on committee of conference with committee of Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, 30, 31.
Stiles, on Congregational churches in 1760, 70.
Stillingfleet's "Irenicon," influence on Wesley, 173.
Stoughton, village of praying Indians, 144.
Stryker, William S., on committee to secure documents of Dutch Church, 105.
"Succinct History" of DeWitt, 94.
Suryn, Father, on Rosmini, 42.
Suydam, J. Howard, on commtttee to secure documents of Dutch Church, 105.

T

Taylor, N. W., influence of, 9.
Tennessee, Synod of in 1859, 24.
Tertullian, tendency of, 182; on supremacy of Roman Church, 206, 207; distinction between doctrine and practice, 209; combats high Episcopal views, 209, 212.
Thessalonica, vicariate of, 217.
Thietgard of Triers, 251.
Thionville, Council of, 241.
Third Haven Monthly Meeting, on slavery, 283.

Thompson, A. C., testimony to value of Eliot's work, 132.
Thompson, Robert Ellis, See Literature United Synod.
Tranquebar, Danish-Halle Mission at, 85.
Transubstantiation, Rosmini on, 60, 61; in 9th century, 232.
Treat, Samuel, 139
Troyes, Council of, 257, 258; Adrian II. approves decrees, 259.
Tucker, J. R., at Convention of 1857 of Southern Presbyterians, 16, 17; agitates for union with Old School party, 29. See Literature United Synod.
Tupper, Thomas, 139.

U

Uniformity, Act of, 68.
Union, plan of between General Association of Connecticut and Presbyterian General Assembly, 7.
United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, sketch of, 3 *sq.*; Literature, 3 *sq.*; minutes of, 5; organized, 6, 15 *sq.*; platform, 17; first assembly, 18, 19; standards, 19 *sq.*; "Declaration of Principles," 20, 21; proposed conference with General Assembly, Old School, 21, 22, 26; educational and missionary work, 22, 25; change in Board of Missions, 24; agitation for union with Old School party, 29 *sq.*; doctrinal declaration, 31, 35, 37; merged in Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, 36, 38.
Urbanus, case of Apiarus, 221.
Urlin, R. Denny, on Wesley, 165.

V

Valentinian III., confirms Leo's claims to Petrine prerogatives, 222.
Van den Broek, Mr., transcripts of Acts of Classis of Amsterdam, 91.
Van Pelt, Daniel, on committee to secure documents of Dutch Church, 105.
Van Rensalaer, C., on committee of General Assembly, Old School, to confer with committee of United Synod, 26.
Van Santvoord, "Dialogue between Considerans and Candidus," 98.
Van Troostenburg de Bruyn, work on Dutch missions in East Indies, 86.
Van Vechten, A. V. W., on committee to secure documents of Dutch Church, 105.
Van Zandt, A. B., 98.
Vaughan, C. R., on J. D. Mitchell, 28.
"Verdegiging" of Freeman, 98.
Verdum, Treaty of, 242.
Victor of Rome, on distinction between doctrine and practice, 209
"Vindication" of James Wetmore, 74.
Virginia, Minutes of Synod of, 5; approves action of convention of 1857, 18; in 1859, 24; charter for bishopric of in 1672, 68; Episcopacy free from political entanglements, 69; moral looseness of early Episcopal clergy, 70.
Voet, Gysbert, 150.
Vos, G. J., 101.

W

Waban, Indian sachem, 118, 119, 122, 129.
Waddel, J. N., on committee of conference with United Synod Committee, 30.
Walker, Samuel, letter from Wesley, 174; on Wesley's lay preaching, 176.
Wampansags, 126. See Eliot, John.
Wampas, Indian sage, 122.
Watkins, F. N., on committee of conference with United Synod Committee, 30.
Wedgwood, Miss, on Wesley, 166.
Weeks, Stephen B., "Southern Quakers and Slavery," 291.
Weiward, headquarters of Labadism, 152, 155, 159, 160.
Welles, Noah, ordination of, 73.
Wesley, Charles, letter from John on ordinations, 173.
Wesley, John, relation to Church of England, 163 *sq.*; High Church views, 163, 164; ritualistic practices recommended, 165; his various rules, 166; before and after conversion, 166; utter change of views, 166 *sq.*; qualified adherence to Church of England, 168 *sq.*; conflicting views, 170 *sq.*; disbelief in apostolical succession, 173, 174; letter to Walker, 174; virtual early separation from the Church, 175, 176; Dathan and Abiram sermon, 177.

West River meeting, on slavery, 284.
Western Church, attitude of towards study of in early Middle Ages. See Latin classics.
Western Quarterly Meeting, on slavery, 290.
Wetmore, James, "Vindication," 74.
Whitefield, on Congregationalism in New England prior to Revolution, 73; opposition to, 73.
Whittier, John Greenleaf, on Lay, 274; on Woolman, 276; on Meeting of 1758, 276.
Williams, Roger, work among Indians, 116, 139.
Wilson, John, minister of Boston Church, 114, 118, 121; visits Natick, 128, 129.
Winslow, Edward, agent of colonies in England, 124, 126.
Winthrop, Governor, 113, 121.
Winthrop, Margaret, 113.
Woodbridge, S. M., 98.
Woods, James. See Literature United Synod.
Woolman, John, 273, 275, 278, 279, 284, 288, 292, 293.
Wulfadus, ordained by Ebbo, 241; suspended by Hincmar, 243; a leading case, 246; case reopened, 254 *sq*. See Ebbo.

Y

York, archbishop of on Society for the Propagation of Gospel, 75.
Yvon, head of Labadist community, 152.

Z

Zeno of Seville, 224.
Zephyrinus, 209, 212, 217.
Zosimus, case of Apiarus, 221.